DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 005 RC 015 582

AUTHOR	Riley, Gary L.
TITLE	A Comprehensive Analysis of Impact of HEP/CAMP Program Participation. HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project. Research Report No. 3.
INSTITUTION	California State Univ., Fresno.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.; Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Oct 85
NOTE	119p.; For related documents, see RC 015 580-583.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Attainment; Financial Support; Higher Education; *High School Equivalency Programs; *Migrant Adult Education; Migrant Education; *Migrant Programs; *Outcomes of Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Secondary Education; Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS	*College Assistance Migrant Program; *HEP CAMP National Evaluation Project; Impact

ABSTRACT

The report is a comprehensive presentation of High School Equivalency Programs (HEP) and College Assistance for Migrants Programs (CAMP) National Evaluation Project findings with particular emphasis on determining the accumulative educational and career impacts of having participated in a HEP or CAMP program. Part 1 provides an overview of the national project and its research design and summarizes program and student characteristics. Part 2 contains an analysis of the relationship between individual background characteristics and student outcomes and the extent to which the programs helped students master basic skills. Part 3 analyzes the relationship between program characteristics (affiliation, residential environment, age, and size) and student outcomes. Part 4 presents the accumulative effects of program participation. Part 5 discusses the implications of the study for program policies and practices including the "up or out" syndrome, developmental versus remedial approaches, postsecondary linkages, objectives as keys to performance, multi-year funding, program renewal strategies, funding support and cost-benefits, and longitudinal data maintenance. Appendices contain survey design and sampling procedures, questionnaires, a brief description of the project's products and a list of HEP and CAMP programs (1985-86). (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JAN 1986
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary L. Riley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED265005

HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project
Research Report No. 3

A Comprehensive Analysis of Impact of HEP/CAMP Program Participation

[redacted]

Gary L. Riley, Ph.D.
Project Director
and
Assistant Dean for Research
California State University, Fresno
Division of Student Affairs
Fresno, CA 93740
(209) 294-2541

OCTOBER, 1985

RC015582

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project was funded by the U.S. Department of Education in response to a proposal developed by the National Association of HEP/CAMP Program Directors. The research grant was awarded to the California State Department of Education and was conducted under an Interagency Agreement by personnel at California State University, Fresno in association with a staff of national HEP/CAMP associates. The findings and conclusions contained in this research report are solely those of the Project and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the U.S. Department of Education, the California State Department of Education or the California State University.

PROJECT STAFF AND ASSOCIATES

ARTHUR L. CAMPA, Project Field Representative, received his Ph.D. in the field of anthropology from the University of Colorado, Boulder. He has supervised and conducted a variety of evaluation research efforts in Colorado and Wyoming, and has taught university level courses in cultural and linguistic anthropology and ethnic studies.

BOB N. CAGE, Coordinator of Field Data Collection, received his Ph.D. in educational research from Iowa State University. He has been the director of over 20 research projects, and has been directly involved with migrant education for over 14 years. Dr. Cage is the author of a statistics textbook, and numerous scholarly articles and monographs.

RAUL Z. DIAZ, Research Associate, received an M.A. in counseling from the California State University and has since served as a counselor and administrator in migrant education for nine years in school and community organizations. He is currently the President of the HEP and CAMP National Association, and was elected to that position in the capacity of Director of the CSU, Fresno CAMP project.

JEFFREY K. ENNEN, Senior Research Assistant, received his B.S. in Business at CSU, Fresno with an emphasis in marketing research. He has several years experience in both public and private sector research design, survey research, and data analysis.

BRENDA PESSIN, National Project Advisor, received her master's degree in Latin American history from New York University and is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Illinois. Ms. Pessin has over eleven years experience in research and evaluation in migrant and other compensatory educational programs for disadvantaged youths. She has served on the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME) Evaluation Committee for over five years.

KATHY PLATO, National Project Advisor and Evaluation Consultant, is the Supervisor of Testing and Evaluation for the Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. She earned the Ph.D. in Educational Administration from Miami University, Oxford, Ohio and has over eight years evaluation experience in compensatory education programs. Dr. Plato is the author of Program for Migrant Children: A National Profile, and has been a member of the NASDME Evaluation Committee for five years.

JERRY RICHARDSON, National Project Advisor, received his doctorate in Educational Research and Testing at the Florida State University in Tallahassee. Dr. Richardson is currently with the Bureau of Compensatory Education in Florida as an evaluation specialist. He has conducted a variety of educational evaluation projects, is the author of several professional journal articles, and is also a member of the NASDME Evaluation Committee.

CONTINUED

GARY L. RILEY, Project Director, received his Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration and Organization Theory at Stanford University. He has conducted numerous state, regional, and national evaluation projects and has directed several large-scale survey research activities resulting in numerous books, monographs, and professional articles since 1972. Dr. Riley has held faculty and administrative appointments in both the secondary and university systems and is currently Assistant Dean for Research, Planning, and Evaluation at California State University, Fresno.

LARRY L. RINCONES, Project Field Representative, received a master's degree in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Texas in Austin. He has taught and administered in educational programs at the university level and has over seven years experience in HEP and CAMP program planning, development, and administration.

ANDREW J. RODARTE, Research Associate, received his master's degree in Education from the College of Notre Dame, Belmont, California. He has been a teacher and dean at the high school level, and more recently has administered a HEP and Upward Bound Program at CSU Fresno. He is currently a migrant education administrator in an Educational Services District for the State of Washington.

DONALD SANDERS, Project Field Representative, is currently the director of a HEP program at the University of Houston. He has taught at the high school and university levels since 1967 has conducted a variety of evaluative research and innovative educational projects. Dr. Sanders is the author of a recently published book and several scholarly articles.

Members of the National Evaluation Project wish to acknowledge the effort of all HEP and CAMP Program staff and administrators to cooperate fully and without benefit of special compensation in this evaluation activity. A special word of thanks is due the Puerto Rico HEP program director who provided a Spanish translation of the Student Questionnaire.

Special recognition is also given to William H. Corcoran, Dean of Student Affairs at California State University, Fresno, without whose flexibility and administrative support this project would not have been possible.

PART ONE

AN OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL PROJECT

High School Equivalency Programs (HEP) and College Assistance for Migrants Programs (CAMP) have served approximately 45,000 adult agricultural migrants and seasonally employed farmworker families since the mid-1960's when the United States Congress acknowledged the need for educational programs which would give assistance to an estimated 1.4 million Americans whose migratory employment patterns prevented them from successfully completing high school and college educational objectives. In 1984 the U.S. Department of Education made a decision to fund a national evaluation of HEP and CAMP Programs to determine the impact of these programs upon participants who were enrolled from 1980 to 1984. This evaluation effort would establish a national baseline data set on the characteristics of programs and participants. It would be the first longitudinal study of Migrant Higher Education outcomes.

A planning committee of the National Association of HEP and CAMP Program Directors developed the research design in consultation with other program administrators and leading educational researchers in the field of migrant education. The study was national in scope, calling for the voluntary cooperation of 100% of the HEP and CAMP programs that were funded and operating in 1984-85, and that had also been operating one or more years prior to that. Fifteen (15) HEP programs and four (4) CAMP programs met the selection criteria and agreed to participate in the evaluation effort. Programs included in the national sample are representative of all regions of the United States and Puerto Rico that have HEP and CAMP programs. Collectively, the sampled programs also reflect the full diversity of America's agricultural migrant populations.

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The primary goal of the national evaluation effort was to determine and document the impact of HEP and CAMP program participation upon the educational and career achievements of the students served during the period from 1980 through 1984. Once identified, student outcomes would be analyzed for each program year in an effort to determine any longitudinal effects of participation.

A second goal of the national evaluation effort was to establish a national baseline of outcome evidence against which individual HEP and CAMP program outcomes could be compared. At the present time, HEP and CAMP programs lack any national norms regarding student outcomes and therefore have no standard by which to judge individual program success. Individual programs, provided with representative achievement data obtained from the national study, would be able to compare HEP and CAMP averages to student outcomes achieved locally. Moreover, a local project would benefit from the evaluation methodology and sets of survey instrumentation produced by the national project staff.

The third goal of the national study was to determine whether any particular HEP or CAMP program features are associated with patterns of student outcomes: educational achievements, career opportunities, and certain key aspects of individual lifestyles. If so, programs would benefit greatly from knowing which features to incorporate into their own program designs so as to maximize the chances of student success.

Finally, it was the goal of the national evaluation project staff and the Association of HEP and CAMP Program Directors to widely disseminate the findings of this evaluation effort through a variety of reports, national conferences, and professional journal outlets. To date, three major research reports have been prepared: Research Report No. 1, "An Overview of Program and Staff Characteristics;" Research Report No. 2, "Overview of Student Characteristics and Program Outcomes;" and Research Report No. 3, "A Comprehensive Analysis of Impact of HEP and CAMP Program Participation."

Research Reports 1 and 2 contain basic descriptive information on the national sample of HEP and CAMP programs: staff characteristics, project characteristics, funding histories, student characteristics, and participant outcomes. Their primary purpose is to provide participating Project Directors with feedback information that is unique to their own respective programs. This feedback information obtained from student surveys, staff surveys, and content analysis of project documents is only available to participating projects, allowing each project to compare itself to the averages compiled for HEP and CAMP programs nationally. Distribution copies of these reports have been provided to a variety of local, state and federal agencies, research centers, and professional associations for migrant education. Distribution copies, however, do not contain individual project information for reasons of confidentiality.

Research Report No. 3 [this current report] is a comprehensive analysis of student outcomes, with special focus upon determining the accumulative educational and career impacts of having participated in a HEP or a CAMP program. The report is divided into four discussion sections: an analysis of the relationship between individual background characteristics and student outcomes; an analysis of the relationship between program characteristics and student outcomes; an analysis of the accumulative effects of program participation; and a discussion of the implications of the study for program policies and practices.

A fourth product of the national evaluation effort is a Technical Report (Evaluation Handbook) outlining the evaluation methodology that was used to conduct the national evaluation, with special emphasis upon how that methodology might be adapted to meet the evaluation requirements of local HEP and CAMP programs. The Handbook includes all of the instrumentation, codesheets, and statistical documentation needed by local program administrators to replicate certain aspects of the national study so that local project outcomes may be measured, documented over a multi-year period of program service, and compared to baseline norms established by this national evaluation effort.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Both conventional and innovative survey research techniques were employed by the national evaluation project to ensure that statistically representative samples of programs, program-years, and participants would be included in the study. Appendix A, "Sampling Methodology," fully documents the sampling techniques and the sample characteristics of programs and participants included in the study. For convenience, a summary of Appendix A is presented below.

Nineteen programs including 15 HEP's and 4 CAMP's were included in the national study. These programs represented every major geographic region of the United States and Puerto Rico where a HEP or a CAMP program had been funded within the past five years. Programs selected for study had to be in full operation during the 1984-85 study year, and also had to have served a student population during the previous year (1983-84). The final sample reflected the entire range of HEP and CAMP program diversity as measured by such indicators as program age, program location, program size, program affiliation with institutions of higher education or other non-profit education agencies, and residential versus commuter characteristics. Due to the sampling criteria, 1984-85 first-time funded programs were not included and are not represented in the otherwise nationally-representative baseline data set.

Each participating program was asked to prepare a complete listing of all participants who were selected for admission in 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984. To be included in the master listing, an individual had to have attended the program at least initially, but did not necessarily remain enrolled for the entire program cycle.

One of the most difficult aspects of survey research among migrant populations is "tracking" individuals through a maze of temporary post office addresses, general delivery stations, and local addresses to their current whereabouts. Projects were asked to screen all student listings to determine whether a "permanent mailing address" could be obtained for survey purposes. In most cases, these addresses were those of a student's parents or other family member who was likely to know the current whereabouts of the individual. Therefore, all survey questionnaires were mailed in an envelope that was printed in both Spanish and English inviting the recipient to open the parcel and return an enclosed form giving the current mailing address of the intended respondent. A high response rate for as far back as 1980 participants was achieved by this referral method. Over 10% of the final responses were obtained by this method.

As documented in Appendix A, the final participant sample for all program-years is remarkably representative of the population served in those respective programs and years. By numerous criteria, the actual population served compares most favorably to the population of respondents. The data obtained through this effort is probably the most comprehensive and statistically representative sample of migrant high school dropout and first-year entering college freshmen data available on a national scale anywhere in the United States and Puerto Rico at this time.

In addition to participant survey data, the national evaluation project achieved a 100% response rate to a questionnaire administered to all HEP and CAMP program staff members who were employed in 1984-85 at least 50% of the time in the project on an hourly or a salaried basis. A Field Representative from the National Association of HEP/CAMP Program Directors visited each of the participating projects to administer a Project Background Information Questionnaire to the Director, to obtain the mailing lists of project participants, to administer a Staff Questionnaire, and to gather complete sets of program documents including proposals, budgets, and evaluation reports, 1980-1985. Appendix B contains the complete set of survey instrumentation and content analysis forms used in the data collection process.

Data obtained at each participating project site were combined with student survey data and entered into a master data system at California State University, Fresno. Ordinarily, any survey data of this type and scope would be most conveniently processed on a mainframe computer at the University. However, inasmuch as one of the goals of the project was to develop an evaluation methodology that could be replicated by local HEP and CAMP projects, all data processing was performed on an IBM-PC microcomputer configured to run software application packages that are compatible with those most likely to be found in other project settings. The Evaluation Handbook contains a full technical reference section on the hardware and software requirements needed to replicate the data entry and data analysis procedures followed by the national evaluation project staff at CSU, Fresno. Copies of the Evaluation Handbook are available to interested individuals and may be ordered through the National Association of HEP and CAMP Program Directors or directly from California State University, Fresno. See Appendix C for details.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Research Report No. 1, "A National Overview of Staff and Program Characteristics," presents a detailed account of HEP and CAMP program features including program origins and funding histories, organizational and administrative patterns, staff characteristics, participant profiles, and aggregate summaries of program activities and objectives. For the convenience of the readers of Research Report No. 3 who do not have immediate access to Report No. 1, a summary of that report follows.

Fifteen HEP programs and four CAMP programs participated in the national evaluation process which involved the preparation of student mailing lists, staff surveys, document assembly, and completion of the Project Background Questionnaire. About two-thirds of the programs are associated with a college or university, while the others are based in other types of non-profit educational organizations.

Half of the sample programs are totally residential in nature (the programs provide their participants with housing and residence supervision). The others are either totally commuter type programs or they enroll a combination of residential and commuting participants.

The oldest HEP project in the study sample was first funded in 1966; the oldest CAMP project in the study was first funded in 1972.

The newest HEP project in the study was first funded in 1982, as was the newest CAMP project.

Although less than half of the first-year Program Directors were involved the development of their initial program proposals, virtually all of the current Directors have primary responsibility for the on-going development of the program. Additionally, Directors have the primary authority over program operations, staffing and staff development, and program evaluation. Ultimate policy-making authority over the program most often resides in the senior line administrator to whom the Director reports, thereby giving most Directors immediate access to high level decisions affecting his or her project. Less than half of the programs currently utilize the advisory services of an external committee, even though the vast majority of the Directors maintain active membership in local area migrant education associations which serves to enhance the program's ability to form "networks" for referral and program advisory purposes.

HEP and CAMP staff members are wholly reflective of the student populations served by these programs in terms of their personal backgrounds, ethnic representation, educational backgrounds, and in many cases their own experiences as participants in migrant education programs. The staff of HEP and CAMP programs seem to serve as strong role models for participants, many having emerged from disadvantaged backgrounds themselves to achieve high levels of educational and career achievement. Over 80% of the staff of all programs have earned at least a four-year college degree, with more than a third having earned one or more graduate degrees. Seventy percent hold special credentials in teaching, counseling, or educational administration.

HEP and CAMP staff express highest levels of confidence in their estimates of program capabilities to meet the educational, personal and career development needs of students. Most would like to see additional resources made available to meet the needs of students, but all are in basic agreement that programs are having a positive impact upon all of their students irrespective of the severity of need that many bring to the program.

Consistent throughout the programs included in the study is the need for basic improvements in the specification of student outcomes and program objectives. Although program documents provide considerable detail on the kinds of services that programs will provide students, very few proposals include the criteria that will be used to determine whether such services have had a positive effect upon the participants. Later in this report, much attention is given to this program weakness.

SUMMARY OF STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Research Report No. 2, "Overview of Student Characteristics and Program Outcomes," is a detailed summary of student backgrounds and family characteristics of the respondents to the participant survey. In addition, Report No. 2 includes a summary of the major educational and career outcomes of participating in HEP and CAMP programs. For those who have not read Report No. 2, the following summary of findings will provide a useful basis of understanding and comparison.

Educational researchers have demonstrated time and time again that "educational achievement" is positively correlated with numerous personal and family background characteristics. That is, all other things being equal, individuals who come from a background of poverty and low levels of parental educational achievement are among the least likely to complete high school and participate in any form of postsecondary education. For the dependents of agricultural migrant families, other factors also contribute to the difficulty of completing high school graduation requirements. Therefore, compared to other statistically-identifiable disadvantaged student populations, HEP and CAMP program participants consistently fall within the lowest quartile of "predictable educational success."

Over three-fourths of those surveyed reported family incomes of under $10,000 per year with a mean family size of 8.67 for HEP students and 7.28 for CAMP students. Only about one in six students reported that either their mother or father graduated from high school, and only about half of the respondents have a brother or sister who has earned a high school diploma or its equivalent.

Nearly 60% of the HEP and CAMP students surveyed grew up in homes where a language other than English was spoken most of the time. The dominant home language was Spanish for most students, but others reported growing up having first learned a Native American dialect, an Eastern European language, or a French-American dialect. In most of these cases, English was learned in school and often without benefit of a bilingual education program.

In spite of this prevalence of "predictors of educational failure," an overwhelming majority of HEP and CAMP participants completed the basic educational objectives of their respective programs. Of all who initially enrolled in a HEP program, 81.1% passed the GED and earned a certificate of high school equivalency while enrolled in the program. Beyond that, 3.5% reported passing the GED at some point after leaving the HEP program. Thus, a total of 84.6% of the individuals who enrolled in HEP between 1980 and 1984 have passed the GED.

The success rate among CAMP students is even more impressive. A total of 84.9% of all first-time entering freshmen reported that they successfully completed their first year of study (i.e., earned sophomore academic status) while enrolled in the program. About eight percent of those surveyed indicated that they completed their first year of study at a later time. Therefore, of all CAMP students served between 1980 and 1984, a total of 92.4% have completed at least the first year of college. Compared to national norms among all first-time entering freshmen, this completion rate is nothing short of amazing.

Over two-thirds of those surveyed have continued to pursue their educational objectives by remaining in school since completing the CAMP freshman year. Thus far, about 13% have completed a two-year degree, 15% have completed a four-year degree, and 2% have earned a graduate degree. Considering that only those who entered a CAMP program in 1980 or 1981 could reasonably be expected to finish a four-year degree by this time, these overall statistics are quite good. Further analysis of this information is reported in Part Two, following.

OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH REPORT NO. 3

Educational research clearly indicates that numerous factors must be taken into account in any investigation of learner achievement. One set of important factors consists of individual student characteristics. HEP and CAMP participants share certain background characteristics that are associated with being the dependents of agricultural migrant families, of course. But beyond these shared characteristics are many individual differences which have an impact upon program outcomes. Part Two of this report examines these individual differences and explores patterns of program participation, completion, and outcomes that appear to be systematically linked to differences in student preparedness, motivation, aspirations, lifestyle, career interests, and personal timelines.

HEP programs and CAMP programs also share certain structural and operational characteristics, with each type of program having developed within the guidelines established by the U.S. Department of Education. Yet, like the students they serve, these programs are all somewhat different from one another in the ways they are staffed and administered, in their relative ages and year-to-year continuity, in their institutional affiliations, and in their programs of services and activities. These and other program features are carefully examined in Part Three of this report and are correlated with patterns of student outcomes. While all HEP and CAMP programs appear to be quite successful in reaching their stated goals, some are more successful than others. To the extent that it is possible using correlational analysis, features that are associated with program success are highlighted in Part Three and reviewed from a policy standpoint in Part Five.

The primary difference between the national evaluation project and the annual program evaluations that are conducted by all HEP and CAMP projects is that the national evaluation has benefit of a large multi-year sample of participants. It is possible, therefore, to examine the effects of time as we attempt to determine the overall impact of HEP and CAMP program participation upon subsequent educational activities and accomplishments, career opportunities, job and income status, and some of the more qualitative aspects of adulthood in American society. These issues are examined in depth in Part Four of this report.

Although policy analysis was not included in the list of major goals of the national evaluation project, certain findings that emerged from the unusually comprehensive data sets provide a firm empirical basis upon which to build a series of policy recommendations pertaining to certain program features and operations. In Part Five of this report, a number of policy issues are examined in the hope that members of the migrant higher education professional community might find ways to further use the information generated by this national evaluation effort to continue to make improvements in the scope and quality of program outcomes.

PART TWO

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS AND PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Experienced educational evaluators realize that many factors have an influence upon individual student success and, therefore, upon the total impact of the program being evaluated. Some of these factors are under the direct control of the program staff and administration: staffing and staff development, specification of program objectives, implementing the program's schedule of services and activities, resource identification and utilization, and others. These program elements are reflected in project proposals and significantly shape the process by which desired outcomes are achieved.

Some factors that have an effect upon program outcomes are not under the immediate control of the project, but rather reflect certain input characteristics of the students to be served. These input characteristics are numerous and often quite varied, even among a specific target population. For example, program participants may be quite different from one another in terms of entry-level skills, prior academic achievements, levels of motivation, and even their reasons for wanting to participate in the program. Such factors often have pronounced effects upon individual achievement.

Some of these individual factors are reflective of a condition of need which may be addressed in the way that a program tailors itself to best assist each participant in reaching desired outcomes. Students with a skill deficiency in reading might be specially-tutored in reading; those who lack basic computational skills might be required to participate in a supplemental math clinic; and so on. Although in such cases programs do not control the extent of input variation among students, they often have the ability to implement corrective services and activities. These input characteristics are somewhat manipulable in the sense that they may be identified, treated, and partially or wholly overcome.

Non-manipulable factors such as one's age, sex, marital status, and reasons for wishing to participate in the program may also influence the effectiveness of the program in reaching desired outcomes, but there is little that can be done to change these input conditions. For example, if it were the case that unmarried students do better in completing program objectives than married students, programs would not attempt to correct this situation by counseling married participants into divorce! Factors like these are non-manipulable in the sense that they cannot (or should not) be addressed as a part of the educational process.

For purposes of program evaluation, it is essential to identify any non-manipulable input factors that might account for differences in program outcomes--all other things being equal. If the differences are of such a scope and magnitude as to influence the overall level of program impact, they must be taken into account when establishing expectations for program success. And they must certainly be taken into account if comparing the outcomes between two different programs or two different program years.

INPUT FACTORS AND HEP OUTCOMES

HEP students who are females, unmarried, perceive themselves as being highly motivated, and come from families where both the father and the mother have graduated from high school are the most likely to achieve the full range of educational outcomes offered by participating in these programs. Not coincidentally, as demonstrated by other research, individuals with these background characteristics are also the most likely to graduate from high school in the first place.

TABLE 1

High School Equivalency Completion Rates
by Selected HEP Student Characteristics

	% Completing the GED in Program	% Completing the GED after Program	% Who Did Not Complete the GED
SEX			
Males	78.8	3.5	17.7
Females	83.0	2.8	13.5
ETHNICITY			
Asian	75.0	0.0	25.0
Black	60.0	0.0	40.0
Hispanic	79.9	4.6	14.9
Native American	82.6	0.0	17.4
White (Non-Hispanic)	92.1	0.0	7.9
MARITAL STATUS [While Enrolled]			
Single, Never Married	82.0	3.6	14.4
Married	72.7	3.0	24.2
Divorced, Separated	86.4	0.0	13.6
PARENTS' EDUCATION			
Mother Graduated High School			
Yes	85.7	0.0	14.3
No	78.4	3.8	17.3
Father Graduated High School			
Yes	91.7	2.8	5.6
No	78.6	3.4	17.5
LEVEL OF MOTIVATION [Self-Rated]			
Higher than Other Students	92.1	3.9	3.9
Same as Other Students	81.0	2.5	15.8
Lower than Other Students	40.0	6.7	53.3

Although Table 1 informs us that certain student input factors are associated with different rates of GED success, the differences are quite small in most cases. Clearly, a majority of all HEP participants pass the test of high school equivalency while they are enrolled in the program, and many of those who do not achieve high school equivalency while they are enrolled are successful in doing so at a later time.

Students who are divorced or legally separated are more successful than others, probably due to certain employment and income needs which may serve as an additional incentive for these individuals. Over 95% of those who see themselves as being "more highly motivated than other students" passed the GED while enrolled in the program. Conversely, only about half of those who indicated that they are less motivated were successful in achieving high school equivalency before leaving HEP.

Passing the GED is the primary objective of all HEP students, yet the GED is merely the first step toward developing new educational and career options. Table 2 indicates that approximately one-third of all HEP students who were enrolled between 1980 and 1984 are currently attending some kind of trade school, college, or university. Most are enrolled in two year colleges and vocational training schools, further indicating that for HEP students there is a strong practical motivation behind their educational decisions: education is perceived as being the means to becoming qualified for a good job, higher income, and improved employment security.

About a third of those who are currently in school are attending a four-year college or university in pursuit of baccalaureate or graduate degrees. Unmarried students are three times more likely to be enrolled in a four-year school than their married counterparts.

TABLE 2

Current Educational Activities by Selected HEP Student Characteristics

	% Not in School	% In Trade School	% In 2-Year School	% In 4-Year School	% In Other Training
SEX					
Males	73.5	7.1	4.4	8.5	4.4
Females	70.9	5.0	10.6	8.0	4.3
ETHNICITY					
Asian	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Black	80.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
Hispanic	70.1	7.5	8.0	8.6	4.0
Native American	65.2	4.3	8.7	4.3	13.0
White (Non-Hispanic)	81.6	2.6	7.9	7.9	0.0
MARITAL STATUS [While Enrolled]					
Single, Never Married	70.1	7.2	7.7	9.3	5.7
Married	84.9	3.0	9.1	3.0	0.0
Divorced, Separated	81.8	0.0	9.1	9.1	0.0
GED COMPLETION					
Completed in Program	70.4	5.8	9.2	9.7	3.9
Completed After Program	62.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	0.0
Never Completed GED	94.6	5.1	0.0	0.3	0.0

There seems to be little difference in the college-going rates of men and women or persons of different ethnic backgrounds. More differences are accounted for by whether an individual passed the GED than by any other independent factor. For example, as indicated in Table 2, a high percentage of individuals who did not complete the GED while enrolled in HEP but who did so at a later time are currently attending school. More than a third of this population are in a trade school, a two-year college or a four-year college or university. When combined with information appearing in Table 3, following, the data on those who completed high school equivalency after they were enrolled in HEP strongly suggest that this is a highly motivated group. Evidentally, with the basic foundation provided by the HEP experience, 50% of them have gone on to enroll in college and complete one or more postsecondary educational objectives.

TABLE 3

Postsecondary Educational Achievements
by Selected HEP Student Characteristics

	% No Degree	% 2-Year Degree	% 4-Year Degree	% Grad Degree
SEX				
Males	88.5	7.2	2.7	0.0
Females	83.7	7.1	7.1	1.4
ETHNICITY				
Asian	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Black	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic	82.2	5.7	10.3	1.7
Native American	91.3	4.3	3.0	1.3
White (Non-Hispanic)	92.1	5.3	0.0	2.7
MARITAL STATUS [While Enrolled]				
Single, Never Married	84.5	6.2	8.2	1.0
Married	90.9	0.0	9.1	0.0
Divorced, Separated	95.5	4.5	0.0	0.0
GED COMPLETION				
Completed in Program	86.4	5.3	7.8	0.5
Completed After Program	50.0	25.0	12.5	12.5
Never Completed GED	94.4	3.0	2.6	0.0

Overall, the level of post-program educational achievement among HEP participants is positive. About 15% have earned college degrees, and even more have gone on from HEP to enroll in trade schools, in an occupational training program, or in a community college. This pattern is consistent with HEP educational philosophy, whereby one's education is viewed as an important instrument of job opportunity and long-ranged career development.

TABLE 4

Postsecondary Educational Goals
by Selected HEP Student Characteristics

	Percent Whose Goal Is To				
	No Goal	Complete Some College	Earn a 2-Year Degree	Earn a 4-Year Degree	Earn a Grad Degree
SEX					
Males	35.4	15.0	9.7	12.4	24.8
Females	30.5	17.0	15.6	17.7	15.6
ETHNICITY					
Asian	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
Black	10.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	40.0
Hispanic	37.9	16.7	11.5	14.9	19.0
Native American	21.7	17.4	13.0	17.4	30.4
White (Non-Hispanic)	42.1	15.8	18.4	15.8	7.9
MARITAL STATUS [While Enrolled]					
Single, Never Married	30.4	18.0	11.9	15.5	20.6
Married	48.5	3.0	9.1	12.1	21.2
Divorced, Separated	22.7	22.7	22.7	18.2	13.6
GED COMPLETION					
Completed in Program	33.0	17.0	13.6	17.0	16.5
Completed After Program	25.0	25.0	0.0	37.5	12.5
Never Completed GED	33.3	10.3	12.8	2.6	38.5

HEP participant accomplishments also include a significant number of baccalaureate and graduate degrees. Moreover, when asked about their "ultimate educational goals," more than a third responded that they are planning to continue in their educational pursuits until completing their studies at a four-year college or in graduate school.

From the data contained in the previous tables, one may conclude that HEP programs are having a positive impact upon students in several important ways. An overwhelming majority are completing the GED while enrolled in the program. Moreover, many others apparently acquire the necessary skills and momentum in HEP to complete the GED a later time.

A surprising number of HEP participants have continued with their career-related, educational pursuits into two-year and four-year college programs. A majority are either currently enrolled in school or have already completed a postsecondary educational degree objective. There is need for additional follow-through of this 1980-84 study population to determine further whether current educational activities will lead to the continued educational advancement of those whose expressed goals are not yet realized.

INPUT FACTORS AND CAMP OUTCOMES

CAMP program participants are far more homogeneous as a group than are HEP participants. As revealed in Appendix A where the study samples are documented in detail, most CAMP students are of Hispanic ethnic origin (Mexican-Americans, Chicanos, Latinos), have never been married, and graduated from high school at the end of the academic year just prior to their enrolling in CAMP.

Table 5 indicates that males are more likely to complete their first year of college while enrolled in CAMP than females, although this difference is fully compensated for by the fact that females who do not finish their first year in CAMP go on to do so later. There is virtually no difference in the non-completion rates of men and women (7.1% and 7.7% respectively).

TABLE 5

First Year College Completion Rates by Selected CAMP Student Characteristics

	% Completing While In the Program	% Completing After the Program	% Not Completing First Year
SEX			
Males	92.9	0.0	7.1
Females	82.1	10.3	7.7
ETHNICITY			
Black*	100.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic	85.7	8.2	6.1
White (Non-Hispanic)*	50.0	0.0	50.0
PARENTS' EDUCATION			
Mother Graduated High School			
Yes	100.0	0.0	0.0
No	83.3	8.3	8.3
Father Graduated High School			
Yes	100.0	0.0	0.0
No	84.3	7.8	7.8
ACADEMIC PREPARATION [Self-Rated]			
Better than Other Students	87.5	6.3	6.3
Same as Other Students	83.9	6.5	9.7
Worse than Other Students	83.3	0.0	16.7

---

*Ninety-five percent of the CAMP respondents are Hispanic. The number of Black and White (non-Hispanic) respondents is too small to make a meaningful comparison between these groups and Hispanic students.

As discussed in Part One, parents' education is a significant factor in one's decision to complete high school and to enroll in college after high school graduation. This is further substantiated in Table 5 which indicates that 100% of the CAMP respondents whose mothers or fathers graduated from high school completed the first year of college while they were enrolled in the program. Of those who did not complete their first year while participating in CAMP, about one half nevertheless went on to do so at a later time.

TABLE 6

Current Educational Activities
by Selected CAMP Student Characteristics

	% Not In School	% In 2-Year School	% In 4-Year School	% In Other Training
SEX				
Males	28.6	0.0	64.3	7.1
Females	30.8	15.4	48.7	2.6
ETHNICITY				
Black	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Hispanic	32.8	10.2	53.1	4.1
White (Non-Hispanic)	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
FIRST-YEAR COMPLETION				
Completed While In Program	28.9	8.9	60.0	2.2
Completed After Program	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
Never Completed First Year	75.0	0.0	0.0	25.0

CAMP students who complete their first year of college while they are enrolled in the program are more than twice as likely to remain in a four-year college or university than those who complete their first year of study after leaving the program. Conversely, students who do not

TABLE 7

Postsecondary Educational Achievements by Selected CAMP Student Characteristics

	% With No Degree	% With 2-Year Degree	% With 4-Year Degree	% With Grad Degree
SEX				
Males	71.4	21.4	7.1	0.0
Females	69.2	10.3	17.9	2.6
ETHNICITY				
Black	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Hispanic	71.4	12.2	16.3	0.0
White (Non-Hispanic)	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
FIRST-YEAR COMPLETION				
While In Program	71.1	11.1	17.8	0.0
After Program	75.0	22.5	2.5	0.0
Never Completed First Year	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ACADEMIC PREPARATION (Self-Rated]				
Better than Other Students	56.3	12.5	31.3	0.0
Same as Other Students	77.4	9.7	9.7	3.2
Worse than other Students	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0
LEVEL OF MOTIVATION [Self-Rated]				
Higher than Other Students	60.0	5.0	30.0	5.0
Same as Other Students	73.3	20.0	6.7	0.0
Lower than Other Students	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ACADEMICALLY "SERIOUS" [Self-Rated]				
More Serious than Others	68.4	10.5	15.8	5.3
About the Same as Others	68.8	15.6	15.6	0.0
Less Serious than Others	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

complete their first year of study while enrolled in CAMP but who do so later are more likely to transfer into a two-year college than those who finish their freshman year while under CAMP sponsorship. That is, 50% of those who did not finish their freshman year in CAMP are currently enrolled in a two-year college, as contrasted to less than 10% of those who finished their freshman year while in CAMP. This relationship is further illuminated by the data contained in Table 7, above.

If it is the primary goal of CAMP programs to provide a foundation of educational experience that will lead students into the completion of a four-year degree, it appears to be essential that students persist in the program through the point of completing their first year. Those who do not complete their first year of study while enrolled in CAMP are likely to continue their studies in a two-year college where only about 1 in 5 eventually re-enroll in a four-year school.

SUMMARY OF INPUT FACTORS

Although the discussion thus far has revealed several interesting patterns in the educational outcomes of HEP and CAMP students whose marital status, sex, and parents' educational backgrounds are different from one another, the effects of these differences upon long-ranged outcomes is minimized by the fact that many of those who do not complete their educational objectives while enrolled in the program do so later. However, the long-ranged outcomes that are desired for HEP and CAMP students go beyond the completion of the GED and the first year of college study, respectively. For the first time, there now exists a body of evidence that the successful completion of each program's initial educational objectives while enrolled in the program is systematically related to higher levels of long-ranged educational achievement.

BASIC SKILL ASSISTANCE

HEP and CAMP programs share the common objective of assisting students to achieve mastery of basic skills in reading, writing, and math. For HEP students, mastery is evidenced by the passing of the GED. For CAMP, mastery is demonstrated by successfully completing the required first year college courses in English and math. In both programs, basic skill mastery is an essential requisite to the completion of program outcome objectives.

The student survey questionnaire contained several items intended to solicit student opinions about the extent to which the program helped them to master basic skills (see Appendix B). As illustrated in Table 8, HEP and CAMP respondents differ substantially in their ratings of their respective programs.

CAMP students who were unsuccessful in completing their first year of college study are overwhelmingly positive in their assessment of the extent to which their program experience helped them to develop basic skill competencies. While this may seem contradictory, one must recall that basic skill deficiencies usually force entering freshmen into developmental levels of first-year courses. These courses, while required for advancement, do not count toward academic (i.e., class) standing and do not count toward the number of academic units that are required for graduation. Therefore, it is quite possible for a CAMP student to make significant advancement in mastering basic reading, writing, and math skills during the first year of program enrollment, but still fail to earn sufficient credits to achieve sophomore class standing. This suggests that it is not for lack of assistance in basic skill development that CAMP students fail to complete their first year credit requirements.

TABLE 8

Student Ratings of Program Effectiveness in Helping them to Achieve Basic Skill Mastery by HEP and CAMP Program Completion Rates

Opinion Item	Completion	% Strongly Agree	
		HEP	CAMP
1. Without this program, I never would have been able to achieve my educational goals.	WHILE IN PROGRAM	46.1	26.7
	AFTER PROGRAM	50.0	25.0
	NEVER COMPLETED	12.8	50.0
2. The program helped me develop good study skills.	WHILE IN PROGRAM	44.2	48.9
	AFTER PROGRAM	62.5	0.0
	NEVER COMPLETED	33.3	100.0
3. The program helped me develop good reading skills	WHILE IN PROGRAM	45.6	44.4
	AFTER PROGRAM	50.0	0.0
	NEVER COMPLETED	25.0	100.0
4. The program helped me develop good writing skills	WHILE IN PROGRAM	39.8	37.8
	AFTER PROGRAM	37.5	25.0
	NEVER COMPLETED	23.1	100.0
5. The program helped me develop good math skills.	WHILE IN PROGRAM	42.7	33.3
	AFTER PROGRAM	62.5	0.0
	NEVER COMPLETED	28.2	100.0
6. I usually knew exactly where I needed to improve academically.	WHILE IN PROGRAM	54.9	44.4
	AFTER PROGRAM	75.0	25.0
	NEVER COMPLETED	28.2	75.0

CAMP students who did not complete their freshman year of college while enrolled in the program but who did so later are in almost unanimous agreement that their programs were not tremendously instrumental in helping them to achieve basic skill mastery. They credit programs for helping them to achieve their educational goals, and are in strong agreement that programs provided accurate feedback as to any academic weaknesses. But they are clearly different from students who completed their first year of study in the program in that they are almost unanimous in their opinions about basic skill assistance.

Compared to CAMP students, HEP participants responded in almost the exact opposite pattern to these questionnaire items. HEP students who completed the GED after leaving the program are in strong agreement that their programs helped them to achieve basic skill mastery and to accomplish their educational goals. (CAMP students are not.) Those who were unsuccessful in the HEP program and have not as yet earned high school equivalency are significantly less certain about whether the program actually helped them to achieve basic skills. (CAMP students were overwhelmingly certain.)

Unlike CAMP, HEP students must master basic high school level skills in order to pass the GED. Mastery of the basic skills results in passing the GED; improving basic skills without passing the GED may lead to a community college or other adult education experience where high school equivalency is later earned. But failure to ever achieve high school equivalency either through the GED or a compensatory community college experience seems clearly associated with failing to achieve high school level basic skill competencies.

Patterns of success among HEP and CAMP students are becoming increasingly clear: with supportive background characteristics (i.e., input characteristics) and effective basic skill development programs, HEP students achieve sufficient mastery of skills to pass the GED or to continue through subsequent educational experiences leading to earning high school equivalency and postsecondary educational degrees. CAMP students who are most successful appear to be those who do not enter the program with academic skill deficiencies that are so significant as to prevent them from making satisfactory academic progress. If entry level skills are somewhat lacking and provided that the CAMP program is able to remediate these deficiencies, students will go on to complete one or more postsecondary educational objectives—although frequently they make a shift from four-year schools to community colleges. If the program is unable to remediate the entry level skill deficiencies, CAMP students apparently drop out of the higher education cycle altogether. These preliminary observations will be further tested in Parts Three and Four where program characteristics and longitudinal effects will be examined in detail.

PART THREE

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR EFFECT UPON STUDENT OUTCOMES

Research on the characteristics of client-serving organizations and the influence of these characteristics upon client outcomes are fairly new considerations in the practice of educational program evaluation. Yet, a great deal of the variation in student outcomes that evaluators often find among educational programs may be attributed to fundamental differences in the organizational characteristics of the programs under study.

If we were to draw a flow-chart depicting the interaction of factors commonly accepted as having an influence upon the scope and quality of educational outcomes, most of us would probably agree that program procedures play an important role. We would certainly agree that resources are essential to learner outcomes. And most of us would concede that individual student background characteristics also play a dynamic role in the success or failure of efforts to "educate." But how many of us who are otherwise well-informed program administrators and evaluators would think to include factors such as program size, age, organizational affiliation, or environmental relations in the flow-chart?

In this section of the report, we will discover that certain program features have the ability to explain up to 30% of the variation found in HEP and CAMP program outcomes. In some cases, these organizational features explain more of the difference found in student outcomes than can be explained by a combination of student characteristics, resources, and program procedures. In other cases, we will find that organization factors seem to make very little difference in the scope and quality of student outcomes--all other things considered.

THE EFFECTS OF PROGRAM AFFILIATION

Approximately two thirds of the HEP programs that were included in the national sample are directly associated with a college or university which functions as the grantee. Others are affiliated with not-for-profit educational organizations, as allowed by Federal regulation. All of the CAMP programs in the sample are associated with colleges or universities and, as such, cannot be included in the following comparisons.

TABLE 9

A Comparison of Educational and Career Outcomes in College-Based and Agency-Based HEP Programs

	College-Based Programs	Not-For-Profit Agency Based
GED COMPLETION RATES		
% Completing While in Program	82.0	71.4
% Completing After Program	3.4	0.0
% Never Completing GED	14.2	28.6
DEGREES EARNED		
% No Degrees Earned	85.0	95.2
% Associate Degree	5.2	4.8
% Baccalaureate Degree	8.2	0.0
% Graduate Degree	1.3	0.0
EMPLOYMENT STATUS		
% Unemployed	55.3	52.4
% Part-Time Employed	15.4	19.1
% Full-Time Employed	29.2	28.6
1984 INCOME LEVEL*		
% Earned Under $6,000	66.1	66.7
% Earned $6,000 to $9,999	14.2	15.0
% Earned $10,000 to $14,999	4.7	4.8
% Earned $15,000 to $19,999	0.4	0.0
% Earned Over $20,000	0.8	0.0

* Income data may not total 100% due to non-responses to this item.

As outlined previously, HEP programs focus upon three categories of student outcomes: completion of high school equivalency; educational advancement through participation in some form of post-program higher education; and career advancement which is usually but not necessarily achieved only subsequent to having first completed the other objectives.

HEP respondents who were enrolled in programs that are associated with colleges or universities reported significantly higher GED completion rates and postsecondary degree achievements than their counterparts in programs that are associated with non-profit educational organizations. This finding is consistent with other research conducted in adult basic education which shows that the closer the linkage between pre-college programs and postsecondary educational institutions, the greater the liklihood that adults will continue in their educational pursuits following completion of the basic education experience.

Students who participated in HEP programs that are affiliated with non-profit agencies compare favorably to those affilitated with colleges and universities in both the income and employment arenas. The slight difference in unemployment and part-time employment may be explained by the fact that more of the college-affiliated program graduates are now attending school and are foregoing employment. Similarly, the slightly higher incidence of upper-income among college-affiliated program participants is probably explained by the greater number who have completed two-year and four-year college degrees. (See Part Four for a discussion of this relationship.)

THE EFFECTS OF A RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT

About half of the HEP and CAMP programs included in the sample provide a supervised residential experience for their students. This is not to be confused with a college dormitory experience, for programs in non-profit agencies as well as some of the college-based programs often provide rented apartments. To qualify as a totally "residential" program the project must provide a common, supervised living experience. Often these programs provide supplemental educational and counseling support to students as a part of the residential experience. To be considered partly "residential" and partly "commuter," a project may offer housing to students requiring it, but does not provide supplemental services as a part of the optional residential experience. "Commuter" programs are those which are attended on a daily basis by students who attend class and participate in program activites but who otherwise do not spend any time at the project site. For our purposes, programs that are classified "partly residential" are divided into two groups: those in which most of the students live in project-provided housing, and those in which less than half of the students live in project-provided housing.

Educational researchers such as C. Robert Pace of UCLA have for years argued that educational experiences obtained in-residence have a decidedly greater impact on students than commuter-based experiences. Students who reside in an educational environment are more likely to be fully involved in the entirety of all that such environments offer than students who come to attend classes, participate in selected student activities, and return to their "outside" lives at the end of the school day. Moreover, these researchers argue, all educational experiences are value-shaping experiences which may include emulating the academic life styles of those who are readily available as role models: other students in-residence, teachers, administrators, counselors, peer-counselors, and so forth. If a majority of the people with whom one has contact are of that educational environment, subtle value shifts may occur which result in continued (life-long) learning patterns. If school is merely one part of the normal day, as opposed to being the normal day, values and attitudes about education are less likely to be changed as a consequence of one's educational experience.

TABLE 10

A Comparison of Educational and Career Outcomes in Residential and Commuter HEP Programs

	Totally Residential	Mostly Residential	Partly Residential	Totally Commuter
GED COMPLETION				
% While in Program	83.0	84.6	88.0	59.3
% After Program	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
% Not Completed	12.5	15.4	12.0	40.7
DEGREES EARNED				
% No Degree	84.7	84.6	84.0	96.3
% Associate Degree	6.8	0.0	0.0	3.7
% Baccalaureate Degree	6.8	11.5	16.0	0.0
% Graduate Degree	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
% Unemployed	44.0	42.3	72.0	40.7
% Part-Time Employed	16.5	15.3	12.0	14.8
% Full-Time Employed	27.8	42.3	12.0	44.4
1984 INCOME STATUS*				
Under $6,000	69.3	53.8	68.0	55.6
$6,000 to $9,999	13.1	26.9	4.0	22.2
$10,000 to $14,999	3.4	3.8	8.0	11.1
$15,000 to $19,999	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0
Over $20,000	0.6	0.0	0.0	3.7

NOTE: For clarification, the "residential experience" pertains to the HEP program experience, and not to any subsequent postsecondary experience.
* Income data may not total 100% due to non-responses to this item.

For HEP programs, the evidence is overwhelmingly supportive of a residential experience as a part of the total program. Former students who participated in commuter-type programs are far less likely to have passed the GED--either during or after the HEP experience. Moreover, only 3.7% of those who attended a commuter-type of program went on to earn a two-year associate degree. None of them have as yet earned a four-year or graduate degree. The majority of students who have gone on to complete postsecondary degrees from residential HEP programs have earned baccalaureate or graduate degrees. These differences are significant--statistically and programmatically.

The employment and income data are somewhat mixed and difficult to interpret. If anything, students who attended a commuter-type program report a higher employment and higher 1984 income rate, but differences may be associated with the fact that relatively few of the commuter-type program graduates went on to school. Rather, they seem to have gone immediately from the program into jobs. This would certainly account for some of the 1984 income differences, but would not explain the somewhat mixed employment patterns found among the groups.

CAMP program data are more limited in their power to demonstrate differences between commuter and residential experiences because none of the CAMP programs included in the sample are totally commuter-type programs. About a fourth of the students surveyed are from totally residential programs, and the rest are from programs where housing was available to all students but was utilized by less than half of those who were in attendance. Curiously, fewer residential program students completed their first year of college while in-residence than those who were from partly residential programs. And a significantly larger proportion of the residential students left full-time study at four-year schools to go to community colleges where they completed two-year degrees and later went to work full-time. None of the residential-program students have as yet completed graduate studies.

TABLE 11

A Comparison of Educational and Career Outcomes
in Residential and Partly Residential CAMP Programs

	Totally Residential	Partly Residential
FIRST-YEAR COMPLETION		
% While in Program	70.6	81.7
% After Program	17.6	11.8
% Did Not Finish	11.8	5.6
DEGREES EARNED		
% No Degree	70.6	69.4
% Associate Degree	23.5	8.3
% Baccalaureate Degree	5.9	19.4
% Graduate Degree	0.0	2.8
EMPLOYMENT STATUS		
% Unemployed	23.5	36.1
% Part-Time Employed	29.4	33.3
% Full-Time Employed	47.1	30.6
1984 INCOME STATUS		
% Under $6,000	76.5	77.8
% $6,000 to $9,999	23.5	11.1
% $10,000 to $14,999	0.0	5.6
% $15,000 to $19,999	0.0	2.8
% Over $20,000	0.0	2.8

From a research standpoint, it is unfortunate that none of the CAMP programs were commuter programs, for this would have allowed making a comparison like that made with HEP programs. As it is, we connot tell whether the differences shown in Table 11 are in any way associated with residential versus commuter attributes. In all liklihood, other program factors account for these differences.

THE EFFECTS OF PROGRAM AGE

Program age is defined as the number of years that a program has been funded and in operation since the first year of Federal support. A third of the HEP student sample were enrolled in programs that had been operating for less than four years (at the time of actual enrollment), one third in programs operating between 4 and 12 years, and one third in programs funded for more than 12 years.

TABLE 12

A Comparison of Educational and Career Outcomes by HEP Program Age

	Age 1 to 3 Years	Age 4 to 12 Years	Age 13 to 18 Years
GED COMPLETION			
% While in Program	73.0	81.1	84.2
% After Program	0.0	4.9	2.1
% Did Not Complete	27.0	13.9	13.7
DEGREES EARNED			
% No Degree	96.9	79.5	80.5
% Associate Degre	2.9	6.6	4.2
% Baccalaureate Degree	0.0	11.5	14.2
% Graduate Degree	0.0	1.6	1.1
EMPLOYMENT STATUS			
% Unemployed	56.7	59.0	49.5
% Part-Time Employed	13.5	16.4	15.8
% Full-Time Employed	29.7	24.6	34.7
1984 INCOME STATUS			
% Under $6,000	70.3	83.6	77.9
% $6,000 to $9,999	16.2	12.3	16.8
% $10,000 to $14,999	10.8	2.5	5.3
% $15,000 to $19,999	0.0	0.8	0.0
% Over $20,000	2.7	0.8	0.0

Table 12 reveals that those who were enrolled in HEP programs that were less than four years old at the time that the students were enrolled achieved the lowest GED completion rates. They also reported the lowest rate of postsecondary degree completion. These differences are significant but are not easily explained given the available data.

One possible explanation is that it simply takes time to establish a fully-operating and fully-effective program. Staff need time to develop instructional routines and teaching materials. Instructional supplies and text materials are usually not immediately available in the quantities that are needed. Rather, materials are acquired over time as funds permit.

Another possible explanation is that established programs have more effective referral networks than new programs. Anyone who has ever administered a special-purpose educational program knows that there is an improvement in program effectiveness when student input characteristics are suited to the goals and capabilities of the program. The more established programs may benefit from a certain amount of self-screening and referral-screening which match student characteristics and motivation to program capacities.

Whatever the explanation, CAMP programs fall into the same exact patterns, as illustrated in Table 13. Students participating in the newer programs fell significantly behind others in first-year completion while they were enrolled, although 27.7% of them reported that they completed the first year after leaving the program. Apparently, they did so in a two-year college where 50% of them had earned associate degrees by the time the survey was conducted. Income and employment data among the students served by the newest CAMP programs also indicate significant differences. One hundred percent report being unemployed at the time of the evaluation survey! As with all CAMP students for reasons that are more fully apparent in Part Four of this report, 1984 income data are relatively low for all program groups.

TABLE 13

A Comparison of Educational and Career Outcomes By CAMP Program Age

	Age 1 to 3 Years	Age 4 to 12 Years	Age 13 to 18 Years
FIRST-YEAR COMPLETION			
% While in Program	60.0	100.0	81.1
% After Program	27.7	0.0	8.1
% Did Not Complete	12.3	0.0	10.8
DEGREES EARNED			
% No Degree	50.0	78.6	67.6
% Associate Degree	50.0	7.1	13.5
% Baccalaureate Degree	0.0	14.3	16.2
% Graduate Degree	0.0	0.0	2.7
EMPLOYMENT STATUS			
% Unemployed	100.0	21.4	32.4
% Part-Time Employed	0.0	42.8	29.7
% Full-Time Employed	0.0	35.7	37.8
1984 INCOME STATUS			
% Under $6,000	100.0	80.0	67.6
% $6,000 to $9,999	0.0	20.0	21.6
% $10,000 to $14,999	0.0	0.0	5.4
% $15,000 to $19,999	0.0	0.0	2.7
% Over $20,000	0.0	0.0	2.7

THE EFFECTS OF PROGRAM SIZE

Another program feature that was examined is program size. When HEP and CAMP programs were divided into three size groups each, no differences were found in student educational or career outcomes. Small and large programs, alike, fell within a few percentage points on all of the measures as compared to sample averages reported in Part Two. It is often the case that program size (organizational size) has a significant relationship to outcomes in client-serving organizations. In the case of HEP and CAMP programs, however, size was measured by the average number of students served by each program in the sample. Staff size is a function of student size, and the staff to student ratio is about the same for all programs. Therefore, size as an expression of client load is more of a constant than a variable. For example, a program with 100 students and 10 staff members would provide the same scope of services as a program with 50 students and 5 staff members, generally speaking.

THE EFFECTS OF OUTCOME SPECIFICATION

As detailed in Research Report No. 2, all participating programs in the National Evaluation Project allowed the evaluators access to all forms of project documentation: proposals, year-end reports, evaluations, and other supportive information regarding program specifications and operations.

The research staff formed a panel of education program specialists to review each project's documentation to determine the extent to which anticipated program outcomes were written as measurable objectives. If an outcome was written in such a way that it could be observed and measured, it was recorded as an objective. If an outcome was implied by a procedural statement, (e.g., students will receive career advisement and counseling as needed), it was recorded as a procedure.

An aggregate set of program functions emerged from the content analysis of the documents, resulting in 27 areas of performance activity fitting within five categories: Management Activities, Program Development Activities, Student Support Services, Educational Services, and

Career Development Services. (See Appendix B for the coding sheet used to determine raw scores for each project.)

Raw scores were converted to a standard scale from 1 to 10 points in each performance category. The maximum possible score was 50 for each program (5 categories X 10 converted points). Research Report No. 2 provides a breakdown of the HEP and CAMP project scores which are for the most part indicative of a significant program weakness. In most cases, programs do not clearly specify outcomes in ways that can be observed and measured for evaluation purposes. More importantly, without clear objectives it is difficult to manage program activity and to monitor student and staff performance.

There is sufficient variation in the scores, however, to conduct an analysis of variance according to the program features used previously in this section: program affiliation, program age, and the residential environment. Table 14 provides the means for all programs in the HEP and CAMP sample.

TABLE 14

Specification of Outcomes
Mean Averages for all Sample Programs

	Sample Mean	Total Possible
Program Management	4.95	10.0
Project Development	0.45	10.0
Student Support Services	6.50	10.0
Education & Instruction	4.69	10.0
Career Development	2.57	10.0
TOTAL OBJECTIVES	20.35	50.0

While none of the averages are particularly strong, indicating that only a few of the performance areas are specified in measureable forms, Student Support Services is clearly the strongest of the five areas. A great deal of HEP and CAMP program emphasis is placed upon counseling and other kinds of student suportive services--and rightly so. This is evident in program documents as reflected in the relatively high score.

TABLE 15

Specification of Outcomes
by Program Affiliation

	College or University	Non-Profit Agency
Program Management	4.69	5.42
Program Development	0.45	0.38
Student Support Services	6.61	5.24
Education & Instruction	4.96	1.81
Career Development	4.07	2.57
TOTAL OBJECTIVES	20.79	15.43

Differences in educational outcomes between programs that are based in colleges or universities and those in non-profit agencies are further emphasized in Table 15 where a significant difference in the Education & Instruction performance area is found. A similar difference, but not as great, is found in the Career Development area. College and university based programs were scored higher in both areas, offering one possible explanation for differences found in the educational and career achievement levels of these two program types.

Programs that are totally and mostly residential are compared to those which are partly and totally commuter programs in Table 16 below. Residential programs scored higher on Project Management, Student Support Services, and Education & Instruction. The edge goes to commuter programs in the area of Program Development, however. Again, these scores are reflective of differences found in our earlier comparisons of student educational and career outcomes.

TABLE 16

Specification of Outcomes by Residential Characteristics

	Totally or Mostly Residential	Totally or Mostly Commuter
Project Management	4.83	3.61
Program Development	0.36	1.13
Student Support Services	6.99	5.29
Education & Instruction	5.34	2.77
Career Development	4.00	3.26
TOTAL OBJECTIVES	21.54	16.87

Finally, HEP and CAMP programs of different ages are compared in Table 17 where we see that patterns are somewhat mixed. New programs scored the lowest of the three age groups in Education & Instruction as might have been anticipated from our earlier analysis of their effectiveness to meet educational outcomes. New programs scored higher than the others in Project Management, Program Development, and Student Support Services.

What is surprising in Table 17 is the fact that the oldest group of programs scored lower in Education & Instruction than the middle group. This rating is consistent with the previously reported educational outcome data, but one might have anticipated that the oldest programs in the sample would have had the strongest score in the instructional area simply due to their experience. They fall considerably behind the 4 to 12 year old group, however, suggesting that HEP and CAMP programs

TABLE 17

Specification of Outcomes
by Program Age

	Under 3 Years	4 to 12 Years	Over 12 Years
Project Management	5.28	3.66	4.77
Program Development	0.92	0.30	0.68
Student Support Services	6.76	6.41	6.50
Education & Instruction	2.41	7.55	3.30
Career Development	3.48	5.17	3.04
TOTAL OBJECTIVES	18.87	23.81	18.39

suffer from the same problems as have been observed in other categorical aid education programs. Namely, new programs are still in the early developmental phase of project maturity, while the oldest programs have slipped into a certain "casualness" about further refining and developing strong outcome objectives. The most dynamic of all are the "middle age" programs which have matured beyond the developmental stage but have not as yet grown lazy with old age!

SO WHAT?

Sooner or later, every educational researcher must confront his or her magnificent findings and ask the tough question, "So what?" So, some programs are more precise when it comes to laying out the details of their management plans...So What? Some programs emphasize project development as a major part of their overall activities...So What?

Most HEP and CAMP programs place greater emphasis on specifying objectives and procedures related to student support services than on any other category of program performance...So What? Some programs have carefully detailed lists of learner outcomes and behavioral objectives while others hardly mention them at all...So What?

There are many pitfalls in the family of statistical procedures known as regression analysis. Nevertheless, when used with caution these procedures are sometimes capable of helping us sort out the independent or unique effects that one or more variables have upon another. Knowing that HEP and CAMP programs display a considerable amount of variation in the extent to which their objectives are specified in ways that can be observed and measured, we now wish to know whether this variation is in any way related to differences that we have found in outcomes. And, if so, we wish to know which factors have the most impact on those outcomes.

TABLE 18

Partial Correlations between Selected Scores on the Specification of Outcome Objectives and Student Educational Outcomes

	Educational Outcomes	
	% Completing Program Objectives	% Completing College Degrees
	Beta	Beta
Program Management	.319	.323
Program Development	-.394*	.291
Education & Instruction	.617**	.634**
Student Support Services	.217	.140

*Significant at the .01 level
**Significant at the .001 level
NOTE: Please see comments on methodology appearing at the end of the current section for a discussion of the statistical procedures upon which the data in Table 18 are based.

The information contained in Table 18 indicates that there is indeed a direct relationship between what a program actually accomplishes and what it specifies as its anticipated objectives. When we exclude most if not all of the influence that other program characteristics have upon the extent to which educational outcomes are actually achieved, we find that programs that specify educational outcomes in observable and measurable ways are more successful in their rate of achieving those outcomes. The extent to which Education & Instruction objectives are specified accounts for more than a third of the total variation R^2 in educational outcomes--program completion and postsecondary degrees earned. Interestingly, a test was conducted to determine whether there is a relationship between what program staff reported about the "clarity of objectives" and the ratings assigned by the researchers. The correlation is .819 and is significant at the .001 level. That is, when program documents specify in observable, measurable terms what it is that they are trying to achieve among students, staff strongly agree that there is a high level of clarity and understanding of what they (the staff) must accomplish. When the program lacks clearly documented outcome specifications, staff report a lack of clarity of purpose and a lack of understanding of that they are expected to accomplish.

Table 18 also reveals that there is virtually no connection between the specification of Student Support Services and whether educational outcomes are actually achieved. That is, these two factors operate more or less independently as evidenced by a very low correlation. This is not to suggest that student support services are unimportant. Rather, it merely indicates that improving the quality of student support will not necessarily have an impact upon a program's effectiveness in reaching stated educational outcomes. There is a correlation (.349) between the specificity of student support services and students' ratings of feeling that staff support and help are available when needed, that they know how well they are doing in the program, and that the program is having an important influence upon them and their self-confidence.

There is a negative relationship between Program Development and student success in reaching program objectives (i.e., passing the GED in HEP programs and completing one's first year of college in CAMP). This is consistent with what we found earlier about new programs and the fact that during the first three years of operation more effort may go into continued program development than into perfecting procedures that are known to result in high rates of student completion. If ever there were a case to be made for multi-year funding of HEP and CAMP programs, this could be it. Startup and development activities seem to continue in most HEP and CAMP programs for at least the first three years of operation. At that point, emphasis shifts away from development and toward better implementation and management. This is not a condemnation of new programs! But it strongly suggests that funding practices which result in a disproportionate number of startup programs in any given year will certainly have a negative impact upon the extent to which that year's collectivety of programs will experience student outcome success. (See also Part Four where longitudinal effects are shown to be the weakest among startup programs.)

A COMMENT ON METHODOLOGY

An apology of sorts is due to those readers who are familiar with statistical procedures and who justifiably require a great deal more in a research report than simple tables and percentages. The project staff are well aware of research reporting conventions, and we recognize that it is difficult to determine from the data formats used in this report what the numbers really mean.

A decision was made, however, to minimize the methodological documentation in the interest of clarity and readability of this report so that program staff and other consumers of this information who lack what we might call "statistical sophistication" will not lose sight of the forest for the trees.

It is anticipated that several journal articles will be written in the near future wherein conventional methods of research reporting will be followed meticulously. If during the interim, however, readers of this report require more information about the statistical methodology, about the levels of association between crosstabulated variables, or about the levels of statistical significance of these correlations, they are invited to contact the Project Director at California State University, Fresno. We will gladly comply with any reasonable request for special documentation or analysis of data.

PART FOUR

ANALYSIS OF ACCUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Until now, discussions have focused upon HEP and CAMP program outcomes that were reported by an aggregate sample of participants who were enrolled between 1980 and 1984. In Part Two these outcomes were analyzed according to differences in student characteristics such as sex, ethnicity, and parents' educational background. In Part Three attention was turned to the influence of selected program features upon student outcomes. In Part Four, we will systematically examine the accumulative effects of program participation taking into account the influence of both program and participant characteristics over time.

There are several reasons that a longitudinal approach is preferred over an aggregate approach to determining program impact. The first and most obvious reason is that one cannot determine what the ultimate educational and career outcomes are for students who have only recently completed the GED or the first year of college study.

For example, CAMP participants who began their first year in college in the fall of 1980-81 would only now have completed the fifth year of study. Inasmuch as the national average for completion of an undergraduate degree is slightly over five years (1984 data), CAMP students who began in 1980 and who have made typical academic progress would only have graduated in June of 1985.

HEP students who completed the GED in 1980-81 would also require some period of time in order to accomplish postsecondary degree or entry level career objectives. Those entering an associate degree program of study in a two-year college in the spring of 1981 could not be expected to have completed the degree before spring of 1983. Those who began a four-year degree in 1981 would only now have completed their fourth year of study.

The second reason that an accumulative approach to determining the impact of HEP and CAMP program participation is necessary is that many of life's conditions change over time. People get married and decide to raise a family in lieu of pursuing a full-time course of study; children grow up and enter elementary school, allowing parents more flexibility to begin college, work part-time while going to school, or pursue a full-time career; job preferences change and with them often comes the need for specialized kinds of educational preparation; educational planning and career goal setting is a developmental process often involving trial and error tactics over a considerable period of time. If we are to plot the course of HEP and CAMP student accomplishment, we must take these factors into account when determining net impact.

Finally, individual judgments about the value or effectiveness of an educational experience are untested judgments when obtained immediately upon completion of the experience. Until one has had sufficient opportunity to test what one believes to be program outcomes in actual career and educational situations, personal assessments of program effectiveness are impressionistic at best.

IDENTIFICATION OF RESEARCH ISSUES

HEP and CAMP programs are founded on a set of educational and human development principals which hold that when disadvantaged populations are provided with the basic skills, opportunities, and incentives to achieve higher levels of educational and career accomplishments than were formerly possible, they will do so--all other things being equal. If HEP and CAMP programs are having a lasting effect upon participants who successfully complete program requirements, and if these effects are accumulative as opposed to immediate, we should find differences between the educational and career achievements of those who were served most recently and those who were served five years ago.

The methodology required to test what appears to be a rather simplistic relationship (Time_1 and Time_2 comparisons) is made complex by the possibility of changed conditions which are known from our Part Two and Part Three discussions to have an influence upon student outcome behaviors. Therefore, three distinct evaluation questions must be asked of the data:

> 1. What are the accumulative effects of program participation upon the educational, employment, and income profiles of students served over an extended period of time following the successful completion of program requirements?
>
> 2. To what extent do individual program features influence the accumulative educational, employment and income profiles of students served over time?
>
> 3. To what extent do individual participant characteristics and any changes that may occur in these characteristics influence the accumulative outcomes of program participation?

By now, most readers are familiar with the outcome measures which were used in previous sections of this report as indicators of educational and career achievement. The same indicators will be used in the longitudinal analysis.

In Parts Two and Three it was discovered that program features and student background characteristics interact differently with CAMP and HEP student outcomes. Due to these differences, it is not practical to combine discussions of HEP longitudinal findings with CAMP findings. However, a summary of the major findings is included for comparative purposes at the end of this section.

CAMP EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

Four program years are included in the CAMP longitudinal analysis of educational outcomes: 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83, and 1983-84. None of the students who began their freshman year in 1984-85 were included in the longitudinal analysis inasmuch as there has not been a sufficient amount of time for them to exercise any educational or career decisions following the year of their participation.

As one would hope, CAMP participant data form a pattern of linear progression through the first year of college, to the completion of the Associate degree (two-year college degree) for those who transferred to a community college, and to the completion of the baccalaureate degree for those who persisted in a four-year college or university. Table 19 further suggests that with each phase of educational accomplishment, a new level of educational aspiration emerges. As one reads from right to left (1984 to 1980) in the table, the educational achievements (degrees earned) and the level of self-declared educational goals (degree levels desired) increase correspondingly.

From the data in Table 19, it is possible to determine the overall completion rate among the 1980-81 CAMP population. By 1985, 55.6% of the 1980 entering class had completed their baccalaureate degrees. In the "educational activities" item above we see that none of the 1980 class was still enrolled in a four-year college at the time of the survey. It appears that all of those who began a four-year program of study and persisted through the undergraduate preparation period have completed their four-year degree objectives.

Others who are currently enrolled in community colleges may also graduate from a four-year school eventually, as may some of those who

TABLE 19

Longitudinal Analysis of CAMP Student Educational Achievements 1980-1985

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
CAMP COMPLETION RATES				
% Completing While In Program	100.0	85.7	66.7	94.7
% Completing After Program	0.0	14.3	11.1	5.3
% Not Completing First-Year	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0
EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES				
% Not Now In School	88.9	14.3	27.8	15.8
% In Trade School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
% In Two-Year College	11.1	0.0	16.7	10.5
% In Four-Year College	0.0	85.7	50.0	68.4
% Other	0.0	0.0	5.6	5.3
DEGREES EARNED				
% No Degree	44.4	28.6	83.4	89.5
% Associate Degree	0.0	28.6	16.7	10.5
% Baccalaureate Degree	55.6	42.9	0.0	0.0
% Graduate Degree	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
EDUCATIONAL GOALS				
% No Further Goal	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0
% Attend College, No Degree Objective	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5
% Two-Year Degree	11.1	0.0	11.1	5.3
% Four-Year Degree	11.1	42.9	50.0	52.6
% Graduate Degree	77.8	57.1	33.3	31.6

indicated that they are not now attending school. This would increase the overall success rate for the 1980 CAMP population by some percent, but strictly speaking those who finish their undergraduate degrees at a future time would would not be counted among the "entering class of 1980." The reason is that retention research in higher education tends to classify such students as "dropouts" or "stopouts." When and if any of them decide to return to a four-year college to pursue baccalaureate degrees they will be considered "re-entry" students who probably based their decisions to return to school on other factors. They are no longer making educational decisions on the basis of CAMP program influences.

Further examination of Table 19 reveals some unexpected differences between CAMP entering classes. Only two-thirds of those served during the 1982-83 academic year reported that they completed the first year of college while enrolled in CAMP. This is substantially below the average for all other years. Even more unusual is the fact that only in 1982-83 do we find any students who failed to complete their first year. It is unlikely that this is true, and we must accept the possibility of a non-respondent bias created by those who never completed their first years of college study and chose not to respond to the student questionnaire.

When comparing the 1982-83 population to others, we also find that a larger proportion of them are no longer enrolled in school. For other CAMP groups we seem to find about a 15% dropout rate after the first year. For 1982-83, the dropout rate is only about 5% (the percent who are not now in school minus the percent not completing the first year). Fortunately, the differences are not so great as to cause us to question the authenticity of the overall success rate: over 80% of all those who begin a CAMP program go on to complete the first year of college; and over half of those who begin the program successfully complete baccalaureate degrees within the five years which is now the national average among all first-time entering freshmen.

CAMP CAREER OUTCOMES

One of the more serious limitations of the national evaluation study is that only recently have students from the 1980 and 1981 entering program classes begun to implement career decisions. Prior to graduating from college, CAMP students evaluate the effects of career guidance in the program according to how well they are doing in their major fields of study, or according to part-time employment experiences while they are attending school. While their assessments in this regard are useful in our reaching an understanding of their career needs and interests, they are probably not valid measures of "program success."

Research on career development also informs us that it may take two or three years of career exploration and experimentation until college graduates are able to make valid (i.e., informed) judgments about the value of their undergraduate preparation. Entry-level career positions are often far removed from the income, status, and authority levels to which most of us aspired when we first chose a particular career field. Therefore, it is not unusual for a recent college graduate to accept an entry-level career position only to discover that many of his or her high school friends who did not attend college are earning more money, have greater job security, have greater buying power, live in nicer homes or apartments, and are able to take frequent vacations in Hawaii or along the southern coast of France! The point is, time is a major factor in an assessment of program impact upon career outcomes.

In spite of this limitation, the career outcome information that is now available on CAMP participants provides a solid baseline data set on which we may at least establish some preliminary outcome findings. As discussed in Part Five of this report, there is need to conduct a follow up on this study population in order to further assess the long-ranged impact of CAMP upon the career profiles of those who made entry level career decisions at the time of this evaluation.

TABLE 20

Longitudinal Analysis of CAMP Student Employment and Income Achievements 1980-1985

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
% Unemployed, Not Seeking Employment at this Time	11.1	14.3	27.8	5.3
% Unemployed, and Seeking Employment at this Time	11.1	0.0	16.7	26.3
% Employed Part Time	0.0	42.9	33.4	42.1
% Employed Full Time	77.8	42.9	22.2	26.3
CURRENT INCOME STATUS				
% Under $6,000 Income	55.6	71.4	72.2	94.7
% $6,000 to $9,999	22.2	28.6	22.2	0.0
% $10,000 to $14,999	11.1	0.0	0.0	5.3
% $15,000 to $19,999	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
% $20,000 to $30,000	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0
% Over $30,000 Income	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
COMPARATIVE EMPLOYMENT				
Compared to Most of those who I grew up with, my current job is probably: (% Responding)				
Worse than Theirs	22.2	0.0	33.3	15.8
About the Same as Theirs	0.0	14.3	22.2	36.8
Better than Theirs	33.3	28.6	27.8	36.8
A Lot Better than Theirs	33.3	42.9	0.0	5.3
I Don't Know	11.1	14.3	16.7	5.3
COMPARATIVE INCOME				
Compared to Most of those who I grew up with, my income is probably: (% Responding)				
Worse than Theirs	22.2	0.0	33.3	26.3
About the Same as Theirs	22.2	42.9	27.8	36.8
Better than Theirs	0.0	28.6	16.7	10.5
A Lot Better than Theirs	33.4	14.3	0.0	5.3
I Don't Know	22.2	14.3	22.3	21.1

Like the educational achievement data, CAMP employment and income data suggest a progressive pattern from lower levels of employment and income to higher levels as students progress through the educational system, graduate from college, and enter the regular work force in entry level career positions. When asked to compare their current job and income situations to those of friends with whom they grew up, the individuals who are still in college reported that they are doing about as well as their friends or a bit worse. After graduating, however, their general assessment is that they are doing considerably better than their friends. We have no way of actually testing these comparisons, but to the extent that students maintain contact with high school friends, it is quite likely that these opinion data are reasonably accurate.

INTERVENING FACTORS

As suggested in the earlier discussion of research issues, there are often many factors which have an influence upon educational achievement and employment status. In the case of CAMP students, we would hope that these other factors might include whether they completed the program and, if so, graduated from college. Beyond that, there may also be intervening factors such as one's marital status or gender which are somehow associated with long-ranged educational and career outcomes.

Table 21 shows that former CAMP students who remained unmarried since being in the program are more likely to have completed their four year degrees than those who have since married. Married students are more likely than unmarried ones to complete two-year college degrees, however. In fact, the decision to leave a four-year college program to enroll in a community college seems primarily determined by the factor of getting married (none were married while enrolled in the program).

TABLE 21

Educational Achievements among CAMP Participants by Current Marital Status and Rate of Program Completion

	% with No Degree	% with AA Degree	% with BA Degree	% with Grad Degree
CURRENT MARITAL STATUS				
Single, Never Married	68.1	12.8	19.0	0.0
Married	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0
FIRST YEAR COMPLETION RATE				
Completed while in Program	71.0	11.1	17.8	0.0
Completed after the Program	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Did Not Complete First Year	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Students who completed their first year of college while enrolled in CAMP are also more likely to have earned a four-year degree than a two year degree. The exact opposite is true for those who completed their first year of college after leaving the CAMP program.

Table 22 indicates that current marital status seems to have little if any relationship to one's employment status, although as shown in Table 23, the income edge clearly goes to the unmarried student. It is doubtful whether one's marital status determines one's income, for actually it is a function of earning the four-year degree. Unmarried participants are more likely to earn four-year degrees, and they consequently have higher incomes. Similarly, students who completed their first year of college while in CAMP report higher incomes because it is in that group where we find the four-year college graduates. Those few CAMP students who have thus far completed graduate degrees had not yet become full-time employed in their career fields at the time of this study, and thus show lower levels of income than reported for students who have completed their baccalaureate degrees. This is more a function of the fact that they are still employed part-time (see Table 22) than of any other known factor. (NOTE: less than 1% of the CAMP population have earned graduate degrees. Some tables show 0% due to rounding.)

TABLE 22

Employment Status among CAMP Participants

	Unemployed	Employed Part-Time	Employed Full-Time
CURRENT MARITAL STATUS			
Single, Never Married	31.9	31.9	36.2
Married	16.7	50.0	33.3
FIRST YEAR COMPLETION RATE			
Completed while in Program	33.3	33.3	33.3
Completed after the Program	25.0	25.0	50.0
Did Not Complete First Year	25.0	25.0	50.0
DEGREES EARNED			
No Degree	32.4	35.1	32.4
Associate Degree	57.1	28.6	14.3
Baccalaureate Degree	12.5	12.5	75.0
Graduate Degree	0.0	100.0	0.0

Overall, the rate of employment among students who have not yet earned a college degree (two-year or four-year) looks better than that reported by those who have completed their associate degrees. Since we know from previous discussions that there is a much higher incidence of marriage among two-year college enrollees, this employment difference is almost certainly a function of marital status and related family responsibilities which may prevent full-time employment (or full-time study, for that matter).

TABLE 23

Current Income Status among CAMP Participants

	1984 Personal Income				
	Less than $6,000	$6,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 to $19,999	More than $20,000
CURRENT MARITAL STATUS					
Single, Never Married	78.7	12.8	4.3	2.1	2.1
Married	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
FIRST YEAR COMPLETION					
Completed in Program	84.4	8.9	4.4	2.2	2.2
Completed after Program	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Never Completed	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
DEGREES EARNED					
No Degree	81.1	13.5	5.4	0.0	0.0
Associate Degree	71.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3
Baccalaureate Degree	65.0	22.5	0.0	12.5	0.0
Graduate Degree	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

From these data, we may conclude that CAMP program success leads to four-year college success which, in turn, leads to improvements in one's employment and income status. Students who drop out of CAMP as freshmen but who later return to school finish their first year often do so in a two-year college. It may take them as long to finish a two- year degree as it takes those who remained in the program to finish four years of college. Unfortunately it also seems to be the case that very few of those who drop out of CAMP to complete a two-year degree ever return to a four-year program. Students who do not complete the first year of college make virtually no educational or career advancement in the time that their peers are finishing two-year or four-year degrees. In time, they will fall well behind those who completed degrees.

HEP LONGITUDINAL OUTCOMES

For many reasons, the path of educational and career development among HEP participants is far less systematic than that observed among CAMP participants. Whereas CAMP programs provide the support that is needed to earn a college degree and, as a part of that process, a sense of career direction and purpose, HEP programs provide a diversity of opportunities made possible by the educational equivalent to high school graduation. While CAMP is a focused activity, HEP is an expansive one.

If we were to study a typical class of high school seniors, we would find that some drop out of high school during their senior year. Some would graduate and immediately enroll in two-year or four-year colleges. Some would graduate and go immediately to work with never a thought to attending college. And others would need more time to explore needs, interests, and options before making any kind of decision about college or career.

The educational and career outcomes of a typical HEP program are as diverse as those described above for our hypothetical class of high school seniors. Some finish the program and enroll immediately in two-year or four-year colleges. Some enroll in vocational training programs. Some go to work. And some simply require more time to explore their interests and options.

Generally speaking, each year a little over ten percent of those who start a HEP program leave without passing the GED. On the average, about half of them eventually complete high school equivalency through another adult basic education program or a community college program in states where community colleges are governed by "open door" admission policies.

About one in every ten who enroll in HEP go directly into a career preparation program following the HEP experience. Usually within the next two years, but sometimes four or five years later, another 10% of the original HEP class enter career preparation programs.

About 15% of every HEP class enter two-year or four-year colleges immediately after completing the program. Indeed, about five percent do so as CAMP students. Between five and ten percent each year join the military, enter apprenticeship training programs, or otherwise make a career decision that involves an initial period of employer-sponsored education.

For those who have been keeping count, these general patterns of student activity immediately following the HEP experience only account for about 45% of those who are enrolled each year. What of the others? The data suggest that about a third of each HEP class spend at least a year immediately following the program in a full-time employment situation that is independent of any educational activity. Others work part time, seek employment, or become involved in other full-time activities such as starting a family, raising a family, or contributing to the care of one's parents and siblings.

Unlike CAMP participants whose second and third and fourth years following their program involvement are more or less determined by the pattern of choices and activities established during the program year, HEP participants defy "linear analysis." Nowhere in the longitudinal data set is there to be found a "typical" pattern of HEP educational or career development except for those few who attend college immediately upon completion of the GED. (In such cases, they resemble CAMP students in their educational and career progression. More on this later.)

Tables 24 and 25, following, yield no discernible patterns of educational or career development. Yet, each program year contained in the tables suggests a high level of educational and career development activity. This apparent contradiction in the data is easily explained. HEP students are on their own developmental timelines, as contrasted to most CAMP students who are locked into the sequential, step-by-step process associated with earning a college degree.

From the longitudinal data in Table 24, it is apparent that a former HEP participant is as likely to enroll in a career preparation program in the fifth year following completion of the program as in the first year. Over time, there is a consistent increase in the number of HEP students who enroll in two-year and four-year colleges. In fact, when taking into account those who earn associate and baccalaureate degrees each year, it is apparent that former HEP participants may decide to attend college after one, two, three, or even more years have passed since completing the program and the GED.

Educational achievement and postsecondary enrollment patterns that were found when examining longitudinal data on HEP populations suggest that in most cases the reason these students initially decide to attend college is to become qualified for better jobs. On the average, about 40 percent of those surveyed from each program year indicated that their current educational plans were to get job training. Yet, many of them who responded in this way are currently enrolled in two-year colleges. We cannot assume that HEP students begin their postseondary educations with a degree objective in mind. Rather, it appears that educational and career development decisions are closely interwoven, each providing the necessary incentive to achieve the other.

TABLE 24

Longitudinal Analysis of HEP Student Educational Achievements 1980-1985

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
HEP COMPLETION RATES					
% GED in Program	87.5	85.5	78.8	70.6	92.7
% GED after Program	0.0	3.6	9.1	2.4	2.4
% Never Passed GED	12.5	10.9	12.1	27.1	4.9
EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
% Not In School	72.5	83.6	81.8	71.8	58.5
% In a Trade School	7.5	0.0	3.0	8.2	9.8
% In a Two-Year College	5.0	5.5	9.1	9.4	17.1
% In a Four-Year College	12.5	7.3	6.1	5.9	4.9
% Other	2.5	3.6	0.0	4.7	9.8
DEGREES EARNED					
% No Degrees Earned	82.5	85.5	87.8	98.9	100.0
% Associate Degree	10.0	7.3	6.1	1.2	0.0
% Baccalaureate Degree	7.5	7.3	6.1	0.0	0.0
% Graduate Degree	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
EDUCATIONAL GOALS					
% No Further Goals	45.0	25.4	38.5	38.8	24.4
% Complete Some College	10.0	23.6	9.1	14.1	22.0
% Associate Degree	7.5	16.4	6.1	10.6	24.4
% Baccalaureate Degree	17.5	20.0	24.2	8.2	14.6
% Graduate Degree	20.0	14.5	21.1	28.2	14.6
MOTIVE TO ATTEND					
What are your current plans for furthering your education?					
% None/Already in School	47.5	32.8	48.5	51.7	39.0
% To Get Job Training	30.0	47.3	39.4	36.5	39.1
% To Complete a Degree	10.0	9.1	6.1	1.2	7.3
% Graduate Study	12.5	10.9	6.1	10.6	14.6

TABLE 25

Longitudinal Analysis of HEP Student Employment and Income Status

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
EMPLOYMENT					
% Unemployed, Not Now Seeking Employment	15.0	9.1	21.2	18.8	12.2
% Unemployed, Seeking Employment	42.5	41.8	36.4	33.2	51.2
% Employed Part-Time	20.0	18.1	18.2	15.3	7.3
% Employed Full-Time	22.5	30.9	24.2	32.9	29.3
1984 INCOME					
% Under $6,000	85.0	70.9	66.7	82.4	90.2
% $6,000 to $9,999	10.0	20.0	27.3	11.8	7.3
% $10,000 to $14,999	2.5	7.3	6.1	4.7	2.4
% $15,000 to $25,000	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.2	0.0
% Over $25,000	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
JOB STATUS					
Compared to the friends I grew up with, my job is:					
% Worse than Theirs	37.5	36.4	21.2	29.4	29.3
% Same as Theirs	17.5	27.3	24.2	14.1	29.3
% Better Than Theirs	7.5	9.1	6.1	9.4	12.2
% A Lot Better	7.5	3.6	15.2	4.7	2.4
% I Don't Know	30.0	23.6	33.4	42.4	28.6
INCOME STATUS					
Compared to friends I grew up with, my 1984 income is:					
% Less than Theirs	32.5	32.7	18.2	29.1	29.4
% Same as Theirs	17.5	23.6	12.1	14.1	36.6
% More than Theirs	7.5	9.1	18.2	4.7	7.3
% Much More than Theirs	2.5	1.8	6.1	3.5	0.0
% I Don't Know	45.5	39.6	46.6	48.3	31.7

Unlike CAMP data which indicated that the employment and income status of former participants improves from year to year, 1980 to 1984, the data for HEP appear to be quite random in their distribution. (See Table 20 for CAMP data and Table 25 for HEP data.) Time alone does not account for changes in one's employment and income status. Indeed, in spite of the distribution of data for CAMP students in Table 20, time was not the critical factor there, either! It is a spurious relationship.

While Tables 26 and 27, following, offer an answer to this puzzle for those who are familiar with the concept of a spurious relationship, an example will help others understand this statistical phenomenon which sometimes leads evaluators to wrong conclusions.

> An insurance company hired a team of social science researchers to look into the possible causes of ever-increasing fire insurance claims. The company was having to pay larger and larger settlements, and it wished to try to find ways of holding down the cost of coverage for their clients.
>
> After a year of studying the data, field visits to fire sites, and interviews with all concerned, the social scientists concluded that the way to reduce the size of fire insurance claims was to reduce the number of fire trucks that responded to fire alarms. Their data showed that as the number of fire trucks increased, the amount of fire damage (and the size of the claims) increased. The social scientists celebrated their victory, for rarely had they seen a more perfect, more positive correlation between two variables: number of fire trucks and the size of insurance claims.

This example illustrates how it is possible to find two variables that correlate very highly with one another, yet have no causal association whatsoever. We know that the bigger the fire, the more fire trucks are on the scene. Since bigger fires cause more damage, insurance claims increase in proportion to the size of the fire (and the number of trucks) on the scene. The correlation between the insurance claim size and the number of fire trucks (independent variable) is a spurious relationship. Actually, the key variable in this relationship is the size of the fire.

In the case of HEP participants, income and employment patterns (the dependent variables) are not directly influenced by the passing of time (spurious independent variable). Rather, as suggested by the data in Tables 26 and 27, HEP income and employment outcomes are actually correlated with educational achievement (true independent variable).

TABLE 26

HEP Employment Patterns by Degrees Earned

	Unemployed	Part-Time Employed	Full-Time Employed
DEGREES EARNED			
% No Degree	56.7	14.1	29.2
% Associate Degree	41.6	33.3	25.0
% Baccalaureate Degree	0.0	33.3	66.7

TABLE 27

HEP Participant Income by Degrees Earned

	Under $6,000	$6,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 to $19,999	Over $20,000
DEGREES EARNED					
% No Degree	78.3	16.5	5.2	0.0	0.0
% Associate Degree	70.0	22.2	7.6	0.0	0.0
% Baccalaureate Degree	33.3	33.3	31.2	0.0	1.2

In CAMP, degree outcomes and the passing of time are "co-linear." They occur together in a lock-step progression. Among HEP students, however, educational achievement is left entirely to the personal timeline of each individual. Thus, former HEP participants seem to pop in and out of higher education at will. As clusters of former participants go on to complete college degrees or other specialized career training, each group's overall employment and income profiles improve significantly as illustrated in the above tables.

THE HEP/CAMP PROGRAM CONNECTION

Where HEP and CAMP programs exist within a reasonable distance of each other, there appears to be a natural referral system operating between the two. About five percent of the total respondent sample of HEP and CAMP students reported that they participated in both of the programs--HEP then CAMP.

Earlier in this section of the report it was observed in passing that HEP students may display educational and career development behaviors that are very much like those of successful CAMP students. Similarities include the rate of postsecondary attendance, the rate of baccalaureate degree completion, and employment and income profiles upon graduation from college. In fact, the averages for students who have participated in this HEP/CAMP combination are somewhat better than for the CAMP population taken as a whole.

As a point of methodology, the HEP/CAMP combination students are included in both the HEP and the CAMP data sets. These respondents answered questions in the Participant Questionnaire written for both of the program samples (see Appendix B). Inasmuch as theirs is a unique story, the following tables will be of general interest to all readers.

TABLE 28

Educational and Career Achievement Profile of Student Survey Respondents Participating in Both a HEP and a CAMP Program

	Percent Responding
GED COMPLETION	
Yes, in HEP Program	75.0
Yes, After HEP Progam	18.0
No, Did Not Pass GED	7.0
FIRST YEAR COLLEGE COMPLETION	
Yes, While in CAMP Program	85.0
Yes, After CAMP Program	8.3
No, Did Not Complete 1st Year	6.7
DEGREES EARNED	
No Degree Earned	75.0
Associate Degree	16.7
Baccalaureate Degree	8.3
EMPLOYMENT STATUS	
Unemployed	58.4
Part-Time Employed	8.3
Full-Time Employed	33.3
INCOME STATUS 1984	
Earned Under $6,000	75.0
$6,000 to $9,999	8.3
$10,000 to $14,999	8.3
Earned Over $15,000	8.3

Over three-fourths of the students represented in the above tables are currently enrolled in school. Most are in four-year degree programs in the colleges where they participated in CAMP, but a few are in two-year colleges and one is in graduate school. Given the overall rate of success among this population, HEP and CAMP program interfaces should be encouraged wherever geography and institutional cooperative agreements will permit.

A SUMMARY OF HEP/CAMP LONGITUDINAL PROFILES

At the risk of some redundancy, sufficient patterns of success and failure were identified in this section of the report to justify a review and summary of major findings. There is a lot of controversy today in higher education circles as to the benefits of obtaining a college degree. Some educational economists argue that when the benefits of obtaining a higher education are weighed against the total cost of earning a degree, the costs to individuals, institutions, and the taxpaying public may not be justified in terms of "lifetime income differences" which may benefit both the individual and society. While this is not the proper forum in which to debate that issue on a national scale, the data obtained from the national sample of agricultural migrants and their dependents who participated in HEP and CAMP programs since 1980 overwhelmingly support the position that the outcomes more than justify the costs. (See Part Five for a complete discussion of cost-benefit policy analysis.)

CAMP students are currently completing four-year degrees within the same time frame and at an even better overall graduation rate than that of all American first-time entering college and university freshmen. The percentage of HEP students who complete the GED while they are enrolled in the program is significantly greater than the proportion of currently enrolled migrant high school juniors who will still be around to graduate with their class two years from now. On top of that, the rate of college-going among HEP students who successfully complete the GED is better than averages established in leading Chapter I Migrant Education school districts in California, Colorado, Idaho, Oregon, Texas and

Washington states, among others. Granted, there are many differences between a 17 year old high school student and a 27 year old HEP student, just as there are many more advantages to completing one's high school education while in high school. Nevertheless, the patterns of educational and career achievement are clear among those CAMP and HEP students who successfully complete their program requirements, in spite of individual program weaknesses identified earlier in this report.

To students who are only now beginning their HEP or CAMP program experiences, the implications are clear: finish the program at any personal cost, for the alternative is to be returned to the same set of educational and career disadvantages that first prompted you to enter the program in the first place. Short-term solutions such as going to a trade school or transferring to a community college are simply not effective in the long run among this population. Students who remain in a college degree program seem to earn about the same on part-time jobs as those who drop out and return to unskilled trades. It is no accident of fate that we find a significant number of former HEP students who failed to pass the GED while in the program return to school after three, four, or even five years to complete their high school equivalency and to enroll in degree programs.

Jobs and income are vitally important to this population as indicated by their questionnaire responses. But if dropping out of school to get a job is financially motivated, HEP and CAMP income and employment data clearly demonstrate that it is probably better to stay in school.

PART FIVE

PROGRAM POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Results of the National HEP/CAMP Evaluation Project indicate that many factors are associated with program success. Some of the factors identified are easily manipulated by program planners and administrators. Others are not. But in all cases, program policies and practices should be sensitive to their possible influence upon student outcomes.

In this section of the report, we will re-examine some of the more important findings of the study and discuss their possible implications for program policies and practices at the local and national level of HEP and CAMP project supervision.

THE "UP OR OUT" SYNDROME

Students who fail to reach program objectives during the time that they are enrolled in HEP and CAMP programs rarely succeed on their own to achieve the levels of education and career advancement that is attained by those who successfully passed the GED or completed their first year of study leading to a baccalaureate degree. In spite of the evidence that some HEP and CAMP students do eventually go on to complete these initial objectives, they almost never catch up to those who did so while enrolled in the program.

With national longitudinal data now available, it is no longer enough to measure program success merely on the basis of the numbers who pass the GED or finish the first year of college. These are necessary steps, of course, toward higher educational and career goals. But if equality of educational and career opportunity is ever to be achieved by agricultural migrant populations and their dependents, HEP and CAMP programs must insure that participants "stay in and move up."

DEVELOPMENTAL OR REMEDIAL?

HEP and CAMP students arrive at the program door with a variety of strengths and weaknesses which are probably the accumulation of any number of prior success and failure experiences. Each student probably brings a unique combination of family background, motivation, learning skills, abilities, and work experiences which we now know have a marked influence upon what that student will achieve while in the program, and beyond.

It is fundamental to the nature of HEP and CAMP programs to be prepared to deal effectively with the kinds of developmental problems that so characterize agricultural migrant populations. Programs have a responsibility to guide, counsel, motivate, and teach participants so that in a limited period of time each one is capable of pursuing educational and career opportunities that would not otherwise be available. In this charge, programs are doing quite well as evidenced by the longitudinal achievement data.

However, based upon student responses and other measures of program outcomes, it is apparent that perhaps as many as 15% of the CAMP population and 25% of the HEP population are ill-prepared to benefit from the otherwise adequate services that these programs and staff have to offer.

By students' own admission, some entered the programs without the knowledge of what was expected of them, what entry-level skills were essential, and what the programs had to offer. Almost without exception these students not only failed to reach program objectives, but were not successful in doing so at a later time. Yet, staff report that such cases draw heavily upon the limited resources of the program which might best have served those who were developmentally prepared to reach objectives without the need for pre-program levels of remediation. Local strategies should be developed which will allow programs (and students) to make informed admission decisions and to better insure that the staff and other program resources that will be necessary are available to serve whatever population characteristics are represented among the enrollees.

POSTSECONDARY LINKAGES

Not all HEP programs are located on college or university campuses. It is not mandated by Federal policy nor by any known educational convention that this be the case, although there are probably some resource advantages that are only available to college-based programs.

Whichever the case may be, one thing is absolutely clear from the longitudinal data: programs that do not have direct linkages to colleges and universities suffer a significantly higher failure rate as determined by the number of students passing the GED, by the number who go on to enroll in some kind of postsecondary educational experience, and by the number who complete a career-related postsecondary degree (two or four-year degree).

The educational climate is of great importance to the shaping of new values, establishing role models, setting goals, and making new decisions about education and career directions. Whether campus-based or agency based, HEP programs should be required to develop local linkages which tie their staff and their students directly to campus outreach activities. Perhaps nowhere in the national study was this more apparent than when HEP students were subsequently recruited into CAMP programs. Where these linkages exist, students who become a part of the HEP/CAMP combination surpass all others in achieving long-term objectives.

OBJECTIVES: KEYS TO PERFORMANCE

The single greatest weakness found among HEP and CAMP programs is the lack of specification of observable indicators of outcomes: student performance outcomes; program outcomes; developmental outcomes. The importance of this finding was demonstrated in Part Three of this report where a clear association was established between the clarity of outcomes and actual program and student performance.

Fortunately, this is one of the more easily corrected problems that might have been discovered. Program planners need to build objectives into the design of each project and document these objectives in such a way that staff and students alike are aware of what is expected of them. Program managers should build objectives into their routine performance reviews and use them as possible topics in staff development. Program staff also have a responsibility to develop and refine objectives, incorporating them into daily routines and using them as the basis of student evaluations whenever possible. Students who experienced difficulties in completing program objectives reported that it was not clear to them as to what was expected, further indicating a need for improvement in the specification of outcomes.

In addition, proposals that are submitted to the U.S. Department of Education should be more competently reviewed as a part of the reading process so as to better insure that the points assigned by readers for "objectives" are, indeed, based upon observable, measurable outcomes. There may be incidents of mis-scoring in the review process, for there seemed to be major discrepancies between the ratings (scores) assigned by the national evaluation project panel and the points which surely must have been assigned by readers to successfully funded programs.

MULTI-YEAR FUNDING

HEP and CAMP participants in programs that had been operating for less than three years at the time they were enrolled reported significant differences in their rate of achievement as compared to others. From 10 to 15 percent fewer students completed GED's, completed the first year of college study, and went on to complete a postsecondary educational degree when their programs were still in the "early developmental" stage of project maturity. National achievement levels for years when there are several startup programs fall significantly behind longitudinal norms (see Part Four of this report).

While there may be other solutions to this problem, none have as many advantages as multi-year program funding. Three-year cycles of program authorization allow local and federal program administrators to develop long-range financial plans, staff and program development plans, student outreach and recruitment networks, and follow-through activities which have all been shown by this national evaluation effort to be associated with improved program performance.

PROGRAM RENEWAL STRATEGIES

At the opposite end of the program life cycle from developmental or startup programs are those which have operated continuously for more than a dozen years. As evidenced by student performance data as well as by assessments of objectives and procedures, these programs are only a bit more effective than newly funded programs. We might call this the "semi-retired program syndrome," suggesting that programs apparently reach an age when virtually no new development or renewal effort of any kind continues to be made. It is not always practical (or even programmatically sound) to redesign a successful project every few years. But, special incentives should be developed which encourage continuing programs to re-examine the populations to be served, re-establish sets of documented student needs and entry-level characteristics, and re-formulate program interventions that are specially adapted to current students and institutional conditions.

FUNDING SUPPORT AND COST-BENEFITS

In recent years and in the roundest of numbers, HEP programs have received approximately $3,000 per student served; CAMP programs have received approximately $2,000 per student served. These figures do not include institutional contributions.

In the simplest of terms, students who are successful in completing the objectives of these programs will repay the total amount invested in them by the United States government within two years of completing their two-year (or four-year) college degree. The repayment comes in the form of personal income taxes, estimated on the basis of average size of family and the net difference in income between those who completed the programs and those who did not. The higher the overall success rate, the more cost-effective these programs become. That is, at the present time only about one-fourth of the HEP population achieve college degrees and subsequently report differences in income that are attributable to their educational achievements. If this number were doubled, it would take only a year following degree competion to repay the total per capita program debt.

Unfortunately, there was not enough time remaining in the national evaluation grant period to allow the staff to complete the extremely complex task of cost-benefit analysis using the approach outlined above. A major article on this topic is forthcoming, however.

LONGITUDINAL DATA MAINTENANCE

The National HEP/CAMP Evaluation Project has compiled a comprehensive baseline data set on the characteristics of programs, students, and participant outcomes since 1980. Although this evaluation effort was successful in mapping long-range outcomes for that five year period, in many instances the impact of program participation is still unfolding. It is impossible to say, for example, what the career outcomes for CAMP students will be because the 1980 class has only recently graduated from four years of college. Many are in graduate school, and many more are only now accepting entry-level career positions.

HEP students pop in and out of higher education and career options according to their own, highly individualized timetables. Five full years after completing the GED, some HEP students are only now starting their postsecondary educations. For these students, in five years it will be possible to assess impact—but not today.

There are many ways to insure that the longitudinal assessment of HEP and CAMP program impact will continue. The issue is not one of methodology. It is one of commitment. Local programs must be willing to incorporate follow-through assessment into their routine year-end or mid-year activities. Host agencies must be willing to develop the expertise needed to routinely engage in fairly sophisticated data analysis, now available on microcomputers. And the Federal agency must be willing to provide the incentives, resources, and technical assistance needed by new and continuing programs to do a proper job of evaluation. Finally, the National HEP/CAMP Association itself is the key to implementing the policy recommendations emerging from this evaluation effort. With their commitment and involvement, continued improvement is easily achieved.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY DESIGN AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES

PROGRAM SAMPLE

The HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project included an initial program sample of twenty-one projects that were funded and operating in 1984-85, and that also had been operating at least one year prior to the study year. The HEP program sample included projects in California, Colorado, Idaho, Maine, Maryland, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. The CAMP program sample included projects in California, Idaho, Oregon, and Texas.

Nineteen of the initial sample of twenty-one projects responded to the Project Background Qeustionnaire, the Staff Questionnaire, and the evaluation project's requests for program documentation, resulting in a usable program sample of fifteen HEP's and four CAMP's. One of the sampled projects was without Federal funding in 1984-85, although it had been funded for several years prior to the study year and was funded again in 1985.

STAFF SAMPLE

All project staff members who were employed at least half time by the project in 1984-85 were administered a questionnaire by the field representative. In all but a few cases, 100% of the staff meeting this criterion responded to the questionnaire. None of the nineteen sampled project were dropped for reasons of an inadequate staff response.

STUDENT SAMPLE

A weighted sampling formula was used to draw a survey sample from among students who were enrolled in HEP and CAMP programs in 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984. Twenty percent of the total enrollment was sampled from 1982 through 1984 participants. Thirty percent of the 1981 participants were surveyed. Forty percent of the 1980 program population was surveyed. Oversampling the 1980 and 1981 groups was adopted as a survey strategy to better insure a statistically representative respondent population among those who were the most difficult to locate after four or five years. The oversampling strategy worked well. The lower response rates (percentages returned) for 1980 and 1981 were compensated for by the larger sample sizes. The 1980 and 1981 respondent populations were as representative of the total enrollments for those years as the 1982, 1983, and 1984 respondents.

On the average, 37% of those surveyed returned questionnaires in usable form. The response rate varied from program to program and from year to year, however, with a low of 11% to a high of over 50%. Any program/year falling below a 20% return rate was re-sampled with the assistance of project directors who provided updated mailing lists with the most current addresses available.

Ultimately, all nineteen of the final sample projects achieved an adequate response rate to be included in the student data analysis. A few of the projects lacked the required 20% response rate for one or more sample-years, and these project/years were not included in the longitudinal (year to year) analyses.

WEIGHTING FACTORS

For each project in the sample, the individual responses for each program-year were adjusted using a weighting factor derived from the formula: Total Number Enrolled / Total Number of Responses. Thus, a program enrolling 100 students in 1982 with a response rate of N=35 would be assigned a weighting factor of 2.857 (100/35). Each student response from that program and year was weighted by this factor, thus producing comparably representative response rates across all program years. The adjusted total response was 823 students which compared exactly to the mean average response rate of 37% for all program-years used in the final longitudinal analyses (.37 X 2,229 surveyed in usable program years).

REPORTING CONVENTIONS

The tables included in Research Reports Nos. 1, 2, and 3 utilize simple percentages to compare programs, program years, and student sub-populations. By conventional standards, this reporting technique would not be acceptable to consumers of educational research who rely upon one-way analysis of variance, correlation indicators, and complete frequency distributions to interpret raw percentages. A decision was made by the members of the research staff to emphasize readability in the reports whose primary intended audiences are personnel who are not statistically inclined.

Members of the research staff at CSU, Fresno will be pleased to provide background statistical information on a requent-basis to those having need for such technical information. Published articles will be written using the conventional standards of research reporting and will provide readers with the necessary statistical background information to make informed interpretations.

Furthermore, members of the research staff are fully aware of the problems associated with regression analysis and multi-colinearity when attempting to isolate independent factors from among a vast array of program and student characteristics believed to have an impact upon student outcomes. Findings as presented, however, were subjected to all possible statistical procedures to minimize misinterpretations due to large standard deviations or other artifacts of data distribution.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTATION

Participant Questionnaire

MIGRANT EDUCATION
HEP
CAMP
HARVEST OF HOPE

HEP / CAMP National Evaluation Project

NATIONAL HEP / CAMP ASSOCIATION

HEP/CAMP NATIONAL EVALUATION PROJECT
California State University, Fresno
Joyal Administration Room 224
Maple & Shaw Avenues
Fresno, CA 93740-0001

Dear Study Participant:

The National Association of HEP and CAMP Program Directors is conducting a study of all programs in the United States and Puerto Rico to determine how effective these programs have been and to discover ways that will make them even more successful in the future for students like yourself. As a former program participant, you have been selected to represent your program along with a small number of others. Your response to this questionnaire is very important to this national study.

Please read each question thoughtfully, and answer each one to the best of your knowledge. Your answers are totally confidential. Your name will not be used in any way. All of the questionnaires that are returned to us will be protected in the same way as other school and personal records.

It is important that you return the completed questionnaire to us as soon as possible. Thank you very much for your time and assistance in this national evaluation effort.

Raul Diaz
RAUL DIAZ
President, National
Association

Gary Riley
GARY L. RILEY
Project Director

GARY L. RILEY
PROJECT DIRECTOR
(209) 294-2541

RAUL DIAZ
PRESIDENT, HEP CAMP ASSOC.
(209) 294-4766

PART I. Please answer the following questions about yourself:

1. SEX: ____ Female ____ Male

2. BIRTHDATE: ________/________/________
Month Day Year

3. ETHNICITY:
____ Asian American
____ Black
____ Hispanic, Latino, Chicano
____ Native American
____ White
____ Other: ____________________

4. EARLIER MARITAL STATUS (When you were enrolled in the Program:
____ Single, Never Married
____ Married
____ Separated, Divorced
____ Other (Specify): ____________________

5. CURRENT MARITAL STATUS:
____ Single, Never Married
____ Married
____ Separated, Divorced
____ Other (Specify): ____________________

6. Did you have any children when you were enrolled in the Program?
____ No
____ Yes If yes, how many? ____________

7. Do you have any children now?
____ No
____ Yes If yes, how many? ____________

8. When you were enrolled in the Program, what language did you speak most at home?
____ English
____ Spanish
____ Other (Specify): ____________________

9. What language do you now speak most at home?
____ English
____ Spanish
____ Other (Specify): ____________________

10. Do you speak a second language (in addition to home language)?
____ No
____ Yes (Specify): ____________________

11. Where did you reside while you were enrolled in the Program?
____ with parents
____ with other family members
____ with friends
____ in my own house, apartment
____ in dormitory or apartment (provided by the program)

12. How many brothers and sisters do you have? (including step-brothers, step-sisters, half-brothers, and half-sisters) ____

13. How many of your brothers have graduated from high school? (do not include the GED) ____

14. How many of your sisters have graduated from high school? (do not include the GED) ____

15. How many of your brothers have attended at least one year of college? ____

16. How many of your sisters have attended at least one year of college? ____

17. How many of your brothers have graduated from a four-year college or university? ____

18. How many of your sisters have graduated from a four-year college or university? ____

19. How many of your brothers and sisters have also participated in either a HEP or a CAMP Program? ____

20. Did your mother graduate from high school? ____ No ____ Yes

21. Did your father graduate from high school? ____ No ____ Yes

22. Where were you born?
____ United States
____ Puerto Rico
____ Mexico
____ Other (Specify): ____________________

23. Where was your mother born?
____ United States
____ Puerto Rico
____ Mexico
____ Other (Specify): ____________________

24. Where was your father born?
____ United States
____ Puerto Rico
____ Mexico
____ Other (Specify): ____________________

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART II. Please answer the following questions about your own education achievements and experiences: (IF YOU WERE ENROLLED IN BOTH, PLEASE ANSWER ALL OF THE QUESTIONS IN BOTH COLUMNS):

25. Which Program were you enrolled in? (Check BOTH if appropriate):

_____ I WAS ENROLLED IN A HEP PROGRAM (Answer all of the questions in this column)

HEP 26. Did you complete the GED while you were in HEP?
_____ No _____ Yes

HEP 27. If you answered "NO" to Question 26, did you complete the GED after leaving HEP?
_____ No _____ Yes

HEP 28. Are you now enrolled in school?
_____ No
_____ Yes, trade school
_____ Yes, community college
_____ Yes, four-year college
_____ Yes, other: _______________

HEP 29. How many years of school have you completed since you were enrolled in HEP?
_____ Years (example: 1½)

HEP 30. Have your earned any of the following degrees? (Check all that apply)
_____ Associate (2-yr) Degree
_____ Bachelor's (4-Yr) Degree
_____ Graduate Degree

HEP 31. If you are not now in school, do you plan to enroll in the near future?
_____ I am now in school
_____ No, I have no such plans
_____ Yes, to obtain special job or career-related training
_____ Yes, to complete a college undergraduate degree
_____ Yes, to complete a graduate degree

HEP 32. When I was in school before the HEP Program, I usually earned:
_____ mostly A's
_____ mostly B's
_____ mostly C's
_____ mostly D's
_____ mostly F's

HEP 33. Since participating in the HEP Program:
_____ I have not attended school
_____ I have earned mostly A's
_____ I have earned mostly B's
_____ I have earned mostly C's
_____ I have earned mostly D's
_____ I have earned mostly F's

HEP 34. What is your ultimate educational goal?
_____ None at the present time
_____ To complete some college
_____ To complete a two-year community college degree
_____ To complete a four-year college degree
_____ To complete a graduate degree program

_____ I WAS ENROLLED IN A CAMP PROGRAM (Answer all of the questions in this column)

CAMP 26. Did you complete the entire first year of college while you were in CAMP?
_____ No _____ Yes

CAMP 27. If you answered "NO" to Question 26, did you complete your first year of college after leaving CAMP?
_____ No _____ Yes

CAMP 28. Are you now enrolled in school?
_____ No
_____ Yes, trade school
_____ Yes, community college
_____ Yes, four-year college
_____ Yes, other: _______________

CAMP 29. How many years of college have you completed including the time you were enrolled in CAMP?
_____ Years (example: 2½)

CAMP 30. Have you earned any of the following college degrees? (Check all that apply)
_____ Associate (2-Yr) Degree
_____ Bachelor's (4-Yr) Degree
_____ Graduate Degree

CAMP 31. If you are not now in college, do you plan to enroll in the near future?
_____ I am now in school
_____ No, I have no such plans
_____ Yes, to obtain special job or career-related training
_____ Yes, to complete a college undergraduate degree
_____ Yes, to complete a college graduate degree

CAMP 32. While I attended college in the CAMP Program, I usually earned:
_____ mostly A's
_____ mostly B's
_____ mostly C's
_____ mostly D's
_____ mostly F's

CAMP 33. Since participating in the CAMP Program:
_____ I have not attended college
_____ I have earned mostly A's
_____ I have earned mostly B's
_____ I have earned mostly C's
_____ I have earned mostly D's
_____ I have earned mostly F's

CAMP 34. What is your ultimate educational goal?
_____ None at the present time
_____ Some additional college
_____ To complete a two-year community college degree
_____ To complete a four-year college degree
_____ To complete a graduate degree program

EVERYONE ANSWER ALL OF THE REMAINING QUESTIONS

PART III. Please answer the following questions about your current employment situation and your career aspirations.

35. Current employment status (check one):
_____ Unemployed, not seeking employment
_____ Unemployed, seeking part-time employment
_____ Unemployed, seeking full-time employment
(WHAT IS YOUR PRIMARY OCCUPATION WHEN EMPLOYED?): ______________________________

_____ Part-time employed, not seeking full-time employment
_____ Part-time employed, seeking full-time employment
_____ Employed full-time
(WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION?): ______________________________

36. What was your total personal income in 1984?
_____ under $6,000
_____ $6,000 to $9,999
_____ $10,000 to $14,999
_____ $15,000 to $19,999
_____ $20,000 to $24,999
_____ $25,000 to $30,000
_____ over $30,000

37. How would you compare your average yearly income to that of friends you grew up with?
_____ I probably earn less than most of them
_____ I probably earn about the same as they do
_____ I probably earn somewhat more than they do
_____ I probably earn a lot more than they do
_____ I don't know

38. How would you compare your current employment situation to that of friends you grew up with?
_____ most of them probably have better jobs than me
_____ my job situation is probably about the same as theirs
_____ my job situation is probably somewhat better than theirs
_____ my job situation is probably a lot better than theirs
_____ I don't know

39. Did you receive any career guidance while you were enrolled in the Program?
_____ No _____ Yes

40. Did you make a specific career choice while you were enrolled in the Program?
_____ No _____ Yes

41. If you made a career choice while in the Program, have you been successful in pursuing that choice?
_____ I did not make a career choice at that time
_____ I am very successful in that choice
_____ I am somewhat successful in that choice
_____ I was not successful in that choice

Part IV. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the number which most closely matches your opinion.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION
42. Participation in this Program really helped me to change my life in positive ways.	4	3	2	1	0
43. Without this Program, I never would have been able to achieve my educational goals.	4	3	2	1	0
44. Without this Program, I never would have been able to achieve my career goals.	4	3	2	1	0
45. This Program gave me the self-confidence that I needed to set higher goals for myself than ever before.	4	3	2	1	0
46. If I made the choice all over again, I would definitely choose to participate in this Program.	4	3	2	1	0
47. The Program emphasized the development of scholarly qualities (love of learning).	4	3	2	1	0

Part IV. Continued

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION
48. The Program emphasized the development of analytical skills (logic, reasoning).	4	3	2	1	0
49. The Program emphasized the development of social skills (making friends and getting along with others).	4	3	2	1	0
50. The Program emphasized the development of cultural identity (pride and respect for people who are like me).	4	3	2	1	0
51. The Program emphasized the development of personal identity (self-worth).	4	3	2	1	0
52. The Program emphasized the development of creative, expressive qualities (music, art, self-expression).	4	3	2	1	0
53. The Program emphasized the development of vocational and occupational competencies (skills to help me get a good job, to help me get ahead).	4	3	2	1	0
54. The Program emphasized learning things that are of practical value (useful in my day-to-day life).	4	3	2	1	0
55. The Program helped me to develop good study skills.	4	3	2	1	0
56. The Program helped me to develop good reading skills.	4	3	2	1	0
57. The Program helped me to develop good math skills.	4	3	2	1	0
58. The Program helped me to develop good writing skills.	4	3	2	1	0
59. The Program staff were sympathetic and understanding toward me and my problems.	4	3	2	1	0
60. Whenever I needed any special academic help, a Program staff member was usually there for me.	4	3	2	1	0
61. I usually knew exactly what the Program expected of me.	4	3	2	1	0
62. I usually knew exactly how well I was doing, (where I needed to improve academically).	4	3	2	1	0
63. The Program made me feel like I really "belonged."	4	3	2	1	0
64. My family supported my decision to participate in the Program.	4	3	2	1	0

Part V. Please answer the following questions about your Program experience.

65. Compared to others in the Program, I felt:
_____ less prepared academically
_____ equally prepared academically
_____ better prepared academically

66. Compared to others in the Program I was:
_____ less motivated
_____ equally motivated
_____ better motivated

67. Compared to others in the Program, I was:
_____ less competitive
_____ equally competitive
_____ more competitive

68. Compared to others in the Program, I was:
_____ less involved socially
_____ equally involved socially
_____ more involved socially

Part V. Continued

69 Compared to others in the Program, I was:
_____ less serious academically
_____ equally serious academically
_____ more serious academically

70 Compared to others in the Program, I was:
_____ less concerned about finding a good job when I finished
_____ equally concerned about finding a good job when I finished
_____ more concerned about finding a good job when I finished

71 Compared to others in the Program, I had:
_____ fewer responsibilities at home
_____ equal responsibilities at home
_____ more responsibilities at home

72 Compared to others in the Program, I had:
_____ greater financial difficulty
_____ equal financial difficulty
_____ less financial difficulty

Part VI. Please answer the following questions in your own words, and as accurately as you can remember.

73 HOW DID YOU FIRST LEARN ABOUT THE EXISTENCE OF THIS PROGRAM?

74. WHAT MADE YOU DECIDE TO APPLY FOR ADMISSION TO THIS PROGRAM?

75. IF YOU DROPPED OUT OF THE PROGRAM, BRIEFLY EXPLAIN WHY.

QUESTIONS CONTINUED ON BACK

Part VI. Continued

76 SPEAKING ONLY FOR YOURSELF AND IN TERMS OF YOUR PERSONAL GOALS, WHAT WAS THE PROGRAM'S **GREATEST STRENGTH**? (What did it do for you?)

77 SPEAKING ONLY FOR YOURSELF AND IN TERMS OF YOUR PERSONAL NEEDS, WHAT WAS THE PROGRAM'S **GREATEST WEAKNESS**? (Where did the program let you down?)

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

FOR PROJECT USE ONLY
_____-_____ FORM 02

PROGRAM STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE
HEP/CAMP NATIONAL EVALUATION PROJECT

DEAR COLLEAGUE:

Your Program was recently informed that it has been selected to participate in a National Evaluation of HEP and CAMP Projects. The evaluation is being conducted by leaders in Migrant Higher Education, including several Project Directors from different regions of the United States.

This questionnaire seeks information from all Project personnel who are employed in salaried positions, on at least 50% time assignments with the Project. If you do not meet both of these criteria, please return this questionnaire to the Project Director.

Although this evaluation is designed to obtain and analyze a large amount of objective information about each project's characteristics and accomplishments, it is also important to develop an "insight" into each project based upon staff opinions and perceptions. Therefore, many of the items that are included in this questionnaire are of a personal nature, seeking a view of the Program from your own professional perspective.

Information that you provide will be used only to develop a "project profile." Individual responses will not be separately analyzed or reported in any manner. Your answers are entirely confidential. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE IN THIS IMPORTANT NATIONAL EVALUATION EFFORT.

PART ONE: INDIVIDUAL BACKGROUND

1. What is your current position?
Position:__________________________
Title/Rank:________________________
[If Applicable]

2. Primary Program Responsibility:
___Program Administration
___Secretarial/Clerical
___Instructional
___Counseling/Advising
___Student Placement
___Recruitment/Outreach
___Residence Supervision
___Tutorial Services
___Other:__________________________

3. Ethnicity:
___Asian American
___Black
___Latino, Hispanic
___Native American
___White
___Other:___________

4. Sex: ___Female ___Male

5. Educational Background:

What is your highest level of educational achievement:
___High School
___Some College
___Baccalaureate Degree
___Some Graduate Study
___Master's Degree
___Doctorate

6. Special Credentials:

Which of the following special credentials do you possess? (Check all that apply):
___Teaching Certificate
___Counseling Credential
___Administrative Credential
___Other:___________________________

7. Time in Current Position:

How long have you been in your current position?
______Years and ______Months

8. Were you ever employed in a Migrant Education program before accepting your current position?
___No ___Yes
IF YES:
For how long:______Years
In what Program:__________

9. As a school-aged child, were you eligible to participate in Migrant Education Programs?
___No ___Yes

10. As a school-aged child, by standards of the time, was your family:
___High Income
___Middle Income
___Very Modest Income
___Low Income

11. What do you consider to be your first language (the one spoken most at home when growing up)?
___English
___Spanish
___Other:___________________________

12. Are you fluent in a second language (in addition to one indicated in Question 11, above)?
___No ___Yes
IF YES, which language?
___English
___Spanish
___Other:_______________

PART TWO: PROFESSIONAL WORKLOAD

13. How many hours per week do you work for the Project?
______Hours Per Week

14. How many direct student contacts do you have in an average day (number of students with whom you come in direct contact as part of your job)?
______Direct Student Contacts/Day

15. How many hours per day do you work directly with students?
______Hours Per Day, Average

16. How often do you do Project work at home?

ON WEEK NIGHTS	ON WEEKENDS
___Most Nights	___Most Weekends
___Sometimes	___Sometimes
___Rarely/Never	___Rarely/Never

17. Are you employed outside of this Project?
___No ___Yes
IF YES
___In this organization
___Elsewhere

18. On the average, how many professional conferences do you attend each year?
___Usually none
___One or two
___Three of four
___Five or more

19. On the average, how many times per year do you participate in staff development activities (seminars, workshops, training sessions, or courses taken for credit)?

______Activities Per Year, Average

PART THREE: ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM FEATURES

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the number which most closely matches your opinion.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION
20. The Program emphasizes the development of scholarly qualities in students	4	3	2	1	0
21. The Program emphasizes development of analytical skills in students	4	3	2	1	0
22. The Program emphasizes the development of social skills in students	4	3	2	1	0
23. The Program emphasizes the development of cultural identity in students	4	3	2	1	0
24. The Program emphasizes the development of personal self-worth (identity) among students	4	3	2	1	0
25. The Program emphasizes the development of creative qualities in students	4	3	2	1	0
26. The Program emphasizes the development of career-related competencies among students	4	3	2	1	0
27. The Program emphasizes teaching things to students that are of a very practical nature	4	3	2	1	0
28. The Program enjoys strong support from the central administration of this organization	4	3	2	1	0
29. Staff morale is very high on this Project	4	3	2	1	0
30. The Project's basic objectives are clearly defined for all staff	4	3	2	1	0

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION
31. I am strongly committed to the purposes served by this Project	4	3	2	1	0
32. I am usually able to observe significant positive changes in students' attitudes toward education	4	3	2	1	0
33. I sometimes feel that we focus more upon Project procedures than we do upon Project outcomes	4	3	2	1	0
34. Local outside agencies have an influential role in this Program's policies	4	3	2	1	0
35. Local outside agencies contribute a great deal to this Project's success	4	3	2	1	0
36. The Project should establish stronger ties to other Migrant Programs in this region	4	3	2	1	0
37. By whatever criteria, I believe that the Project benefits a clear majority of the participants	4	3	2	1	0
38. More emphasis should be placed on staff development in the Project's day to day operations	4	3	2	1	0
39. Instructional outcomes are what really matter in a Program like this	4	3	2	1	0
40. Personal development is what really matters in a Program like this	4	3	2	1	0
41. Career-related skills are the things that really matter in a Program like this	4	3	2	1	0

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	NO OPINION
42. I am very satisfied with my current position; I would probably not leave it, even for a job that pays more	4	3	2	1	0
43. My current position will lead me to improved career opportunities	4	3	2	1	0
44. A major problem in this Program is the lack of adequate resources to really do an effective job	4	3	2	1	0
45. Students often join the Project without knowing what is expected of them	4	3	2	1	0
46. Federal regulations seem to often interfere with the Program's need for flexibility	4	3	2	1	0
47. Program needs and the local agency's policies are often in conflict	4	3	2	1	0
48. I participate often in making Program decisions which directly influence student outcomes	4	3	2	1	0
49. Staff have need for more feedback regarding program effectiveness	4	3	2	1	0
50. Staff should be given more personal feedback with regard to their performance	4	3	2	1	0

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

PLEASE RETURN YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE
TO THE FIELD REPRESENTATIVE

YOU ANSWERS WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL

FOR PROJECT USE ONLY
_____-_____ FORM 01

PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION
HEP/CAMP NATIONAL EVALUATION PROJECT

DEAR PROJECT DIRECTOR:

This questionnaire seeks background information about your Project that is not readily available from other sources. To complete all of the items in this questionnaire, it may be necessary for you to consult with others at your institution or agency. For this reason, your Field Representative has provided you with this form well in advance of his scheduled visit to your project site.

If you have difficulty obtaining any of the information requested, or if it is unclear to you exactly what we seek in a particular item, please make a note of it and consult with your field representative when he visits your Program. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR VALUABLE ASSISTANCE IN THIS STUDY!

PART ONE: ORIGIN OF PROJECT

1. First Program Year that Project was Federally funded: 19____-19____

2. Including 1984-1985, how many years has this Project been operating at this agency/institution:______Years

3. Who had PRIMARY responsibility for developing the first year proposal:
   - ___Project Director
   - ___Agency Grant Specialist
   - ___Agency Administrator
   - ___Agency Staff/Committee
   - ___External Consultant
   - ___Other:____________________________

4. Was the CURRENT Project Director in any way involved in developing the first year proposal?
   ___No ___Yes
   Describe Briefly:

5. Was an external advisory committee involved in planning the first year project?
   ___No ___Yes
   Describe Briefly:

6. Did the agency/institution commit resources to the first year Project?

CASH CONTRIBUTIONS: ___No ___Yes
IN-KIND RESOURCES: ___No ___Yes
Describe Briefly:

7. Since the first year award, has the Federal funding for the Project been interrupted (discontinued)?
___No
___Yes (Answer the following):
For how long:______YRS
During this time, did the Project continue to operate?
___No
___Yes HOW? ___Agency Funds
___State Funds
___Other Funds [Specify]:

8. How many students has the Project served each of the following years:
1984-1985:________________
1983-1984:________________
1982-1983:________________
1981-1982:________________
1980-1981:________________

9. As originally proposed, was Project:
___Totally Residential
___Largely Residential (over 50%)
___Somewhat Residential (under 50%)
___Totally Commuter-Attended

10. Describe briefly any changes in the residential/commuter status of the Project since its first year:

PART TWO: PROJECT ORGANIZATION

11. Who has ultimate policy-making authority over the Project?
___Agency Chief Executive Officer
___Other Senior Line Administrator
___Project Director
___Other (Specify):________________

12. To whom does the Project Director officially report?
NAME:________________
TITLE:________________

13. Who is primarily responsible for evaluating the 1984-1985 Project?
___Project Director
___Agency Evaluation Specialist
___Third-Party, Outside Evaluator
___Other:______________________

14. Does the Project currently have an External Advisory Committee?
___No ___Yes
Why not: Describe Membership:

How often does the Committee meet:
_______Times a Year

15. Who maintains the fiscal records of the Project as required by Federal Regulations?
___Agency Fiscal Administrator
___Special Projects Fiscal Officer
___External Auditor/Accounting Firm
___Other:______________________

16. What was the total Federal award for each of the following years:
1984-1985:______________________
1983-1984:______________________
1982-1983:______________________
1981-1982:______________________
1980-1981:______________________

[PLEASE ASSIST US BY PROVIDING THE FIELD REPRESENTATIVE WITH COPIES OF YOUR LINE-ITEM BUDGET FOR EACH OF THE ABOVE YEARS]

17. Briefly describe any inadequacies in your current Federal award (areas of the approved budget where you think the Project suffers from a lack of funding):

18. Briefly describe any organizational or related administrative problems you may have which you would like to see corrected:

PART THREE: PROJECT STAFF RESOURCES

19. Director: _____Hours Per Week
_____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

20. Professional Staff Resources
PLEASE COMPLETE ONE ITEM FOR EACH OF THE PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS THAT THIS PROJECT CURRENTLY INCLUDES IN ITS BUDGET. Examples include Assistant Director, Coordinators, Instructors, Residence Supervisors, Recruiters, Placement Specialists, Counselors, Evaluators.

______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

_______________ _____Hours Per Week
POSITION _____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

21. Secretarial: _____Hours Per Week
_____Months Per Year
_____% Federal
_____% Other Funds

22. Does the Project employ:
(check all that apply)
___Student Assistants as Tutors
___Student Assistants as Peer Counselors/Advisors
___Student Assistants as Residence Assistants

23. What would you estimate to be the "typical" annual turnover rate among the Project's staff, excluding hourly personnel and student assistants?
_____% Average Turnover Per Year

24. How often does the Project staff participate in staff development programs and activities?
___Not at all
___Once or twice a year
___Three to five times a year
___Six to nine times a year
___More than nine times a year

25. When recruiting for administrative and other professional staff, does the Project recruit:
___Locally only
___at least State-Wide
___at least Regionally
___Nationally

26. Does the Project make it a special point to employ former HEP and CAMP students for appropriate positions?
___No ___Yes
For what positions?
____
____
____
____

27. How many of the Project's full-time staff were formerly employees of the agency or institution?
______Staff were former employees

28. Do professional-level Project staff have tenure rights or retreat rights at your agency or institution?
___No ___Yes, some do
___Yes, all do

PART FOUR: STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

1984-1985: STUDENTS SEX:

_____Male
_____Female

MARITAL STATUS:

_____Married
_____Unmarried

ETHNICITY:

_____Asian American
_____Black
_____Latino, Hispanic
_____Native American
_____Southeast Asian
_____White
_____Other

AGE:

_____17 to 20 years
_____21 to 25 years
_____26 to 30 years
_____over 30 years

MIGRANT STATUS:

_____Interstate
_____Intrastate
_____Seasonal Farmworker

1983-1984 STUDENTS SEX:

_____Male
_____Female

MARITAL STATUS:

_____Married
_____Unmarried

ETHNICITY:

_____Asian American
_____Black
_____Latino, Hispanic
_____Native American
_____Southeast Asian
_____White
_____Other

AGE:

_____17 to 20 years
_____21 to 25 years
_____26 to 30 years
_____over 30 years

MIGRANT STATUS:

_____Interstate
_____Intrastate
_____Seasonal Farmworker

1982-1983: STUDENTS SEX:
_____Male
_____Female

MARITAL STATUS:
_____Married
_____Unmarried

ETHNICITY:
_____Asian American
_____Black
_____Latino, Hispanic
_____Native American
_____Southeast Asian
_____White
_____Other

AGE:
_____17 to 20 years
_____21 to 25 years
_____26 to 30 years
_____over 30 years

MIGRANT STATUS:
_____Interstate
_____Intrastate
_____Seasonal Farmworker

1981-1982 STUDENTS SEX:
_____Male
_____Female

MARITAL STATUS:
_____Married
_____Unmarried

ETHNICITY:
_____Asian American
_____Black
_____Latino, Hispanic
_____Native American
_____Southeast Asian
_____White
_____Other

AGE:
_____17 to 20 years
_____21 to 25 years
_____26 to 30 years
_____over 30 years

MIGRANT STATUS:
_____Interstate
_____Intrastate
_____Seasonal Farmworker

1980-1981 STUDENTS SEX:
_____Male
_____Female

MARITAL STATUS:
_____Married
_____Unmarried

ETHNICITY:
_____Asian American
_____Black
_____Latino, Hispanic
_____Native American
_____Southeast Asian
_____White
_____Other

AGE:
_____17 to 20 years
_____21 to 25 years
_____26 to 30 years
_____over 30 years

MIGRANT STATUS:
_____Interstate
_____Intrastate
_____Seasonal Farmworker

29. Please provide your most accurate estimate (or count, if available) of the number of students who left the Program before completing their educational objectives:

	NUMBER	PERCENT
In 1983-1984:	__________	_______
In 1982-1983:	__________	_______
In 1981-1982:	__________	_______
In 1980-1981:	__________	_______

PART FIVE: TECHNICAL CAPACITIES

30. Does the Project have access to a microcomputer?
___No
___Yes, Project-owned
___Yes, Project-leased
___Yes, Agency-provided
IF YES, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:
Manufacturer:_______________________
Model:______________________________
Kbytes of RAM:______________________
Number of Floppy Disk Drives:_______
Any Fixed (Hard Disk) Medium:_______
IF YES, Total Storage:________MB
Graphics Capability: ___No ___Yes
Monitor: ___Monochrome ___Color

MICROCOMPUTER INFORMATION CONTINUED
Place a check mark beside all uses that are currently made of the CPU:

___Word Processing
___Budget Preparation & Analysis
___Data Based Management (DBMS)
___Individual Student Evaluation
___Program Evaluation
___Instruction
___Other:___________________________

PLEASE NOTE: The rest of this questionnaire is optional. One of the objectives of this national evaluation project is to determine whether a uniform evaluation methodology for all HEP and CAMP Programs might be practical. If you like, you may discuss these matters further with your Field Representative, or give us a call at California State University, Fresno: (209) 294-2541.

31. Have you ever conducted a follow-up study of your former students:
___No ___Yes
IF YES:
What Year:__________
No. Surveyed:_______
No. Responses:______
What kind of survey?
___Telephone
___Questionnaire
Results available?
___No ___Yes

32. Would you like to participate in a National Migrant Higher Education Data System?
___No ___Uncertain ___Yes

THANK YOU FOR YOUR VALUABLE ASSISTANCE

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES ANALYSIS FORM

(1-3) __________ 1. PROJECT ID NUMBER

(4-5) __________ 2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT TOTAL

(6-7) __________ 3. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TOTAL

(8-9) __________ 4. SUPPORT SERVICES TOTAL

(10-11) __________ 5. EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES TOTAL

(12-13) __________ 6. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES TOTAL

(14-16) __________ 7. TOTAL PROGRAM OBJECTIVES SCORE

DIRECTIONS: Rate each of the following objectives as specified in the program proposal according to the following KEY:

NOT INCLUDED=0
PROCEDURALLY DEFINED=1
OUTCOME SPECIFIC=3

PART ONE: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

(17) ______ 8. Program Publicity
(18) ______ 9. Outreach/Recruitment/Enrollment
(19) ______10. Student Orientation
(20) ______11. Staffing (Hire, Maintain)
(21) ______12. Fiscal Maintenance
(22) ______13. Program Evaluation
(23) ______14. Student Evaluation
(24) ______15. Student Retention
(25) ______16. Inter-agency Linkages

PART TWO: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

(26) ______17. Staff Development
(27) ______18. Curriculum Development
(28) ______19. Funding Development
(29) ______20. Services Development
(30) ______21. Employment Development

PART THREE: SUPPORT SERVICES

(31) ______22. Health Services
(32) ______23. Academic Placement Services
(33) ______24. Job Placemenmt Services
(34) ______25. Counseling-Personal
(35) ______26. Counseling-Academic
(36) ______27. Counseling-Career
(37) ______28. Counseling-Financial
(38) ______29. Financial Aid
(39) ______30. Residential Services
(40) ______31. Recreational Services

(41) _____32. Cultural Support/Awareness

EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

(42) _____33. Tutorial Assistance
(43) _____34. Math Skill Development
(44) _____35. Reading Skill Development
(45) _____36. Writing Skill Development
(46) _____37. Study Skill Development
(47) _____38. Educational Advancement (GED or College)

CAREER RELATED OUTCOMES

(48) _____39. Career Awareness (occupational outlook, opportunities, educational outlook)
(49) _____40. Self-Assessment (interests, strengths)
(50) _____41. Occupational/Career Skill Development
(51) _____42. Cooperative Educ/On Job Training
(52) _____43. Employment Placement
(53) _____44. Career Planning/Goals Identification

APPENDIX C

PRODUCTS

PRODUCTS OF THE EVALUATION EFFORT

Several written products have resulted from the national evaluation effort including this current research report. Several hundred copies of these documents have been printed and distributed to agencies and individuals having an association with migrant education in accordance with the provisions of the U.S.D.E. grant.

Additionally, an Executive Summary of the evaluation findings will be made available to a diverse audience of migrant educators, program evaluators, educational researchers, clearinghouses, education agencies and legislators. The Summary is brief, consisting of about 12 pages of narrative which describes the purpose and outcomes of the evaluation.

For additional copies of the research reports, evaluation handbook, and Executive Summary, individuals may write to Gary L. Riley, Office of the Dean of Student Affairs, 224 Joyal Administration Bldg., CSUF, Cedar and Shaw Avenues, Fresno, CA 93740 or phone (209) 294-2541. For additional information regarding HEP and CAMP programs, contact your nearest HEP or CAMP program director (see listing in Appendix D) or the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Migrant Education.

Copies of project documents will be made available without charge for as long as supplies last. If requests exceed the number of copies on hand, CSUF will provide them for the actual cost of printing and mailing until June of 1986 after which time it will be necessary to order materials directly from the HEP/CAMP National Association.

APPENDIX D

A LISTING OF 1985-86 HEP/CAMP PROJECTS

APPENDIX D

COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF FUNDED HEP AND CAMP PROGRAMS (1985-86)

HEPS

Central Valley Opportunity Ctr.
1743 N. Ashby Road
P.O. Box 2307
Merced, CA 95344
(209) 383-2415
Director: Mr. Bernard Wagner

University of the Pacific
3601 Pacific Avenue
Stockton, CA 95211
(209) 946-2520
Director: Mr. Perfecto Munoz

IDEAS
415 Quail Circle
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 442-3557
Director: Ms. Martha Beun

University of Colorado
Campus Box 249, Education Bldg.
Boulder, CO 80309-0249
(303) 492-5416
Director: Dr. Arthur Campa

Boise State University
1910 University Dr., Room E-214
Boise, ID 83725
(208) 385-1194
Director: Dr. Jay Fuhriman

Indiana University at Kokomo
2300 South Washington St.
Kokomo, IN 46902
(317) 453-2000 ex. 268
Director: Dr. Carmen Natal

Fort Hays State University
Department of Education
Hays City, KS 67601
(913) 628-4000
Director: Ms. Edith Dobbs

Training & Development Corp.
P.O. Box 1136
Bangor, ME 04401
(207) 945-9431
Director: Mr. David Bridgham

HEPS

Center for Human Services
5530 Wisconsin Avenue
Chevy Chase, MD 20815
(301) 654-2550
Director: Mr. Gerardo Martinez

Mississippi Valley State Univ.
P.O. Box 125, Continuing Ed.
Itta Bena, MS 38941
(601) 254-9041 ex. 6218
Director: Ms. Bettye Mullen

Northern New Mexico Comm. College
El Rito, NM 87530
(505) 581-4434
Director: Mr. Adrian Ortiz

N. Carolina Commission of Indian Aff.
P.O. Box 27228
Raleigh, NC 27611
(919) 733-5998
Director: Ms. Wanda Burns-Ramsey

University of Oregon
270 Emerald Hall
Eugene, OR 97403
(503) 686-3531
Director: Dr. Manuel Pacheco

The Catholic Univ. of Puerto Rico
Ponce, Puerto Rico 00732
(809) 843-3265
Director: Mr. Orlando Colon

Inter American Univ. of Puerto Rico
San German Campus
San German,Puerto Rico 00732
(809) 892-1095 ex. 310
Director: Ms. Norma Lugo

University of Tennessee
20 Claxton Education Bldg.
Knoxville, TN 37996
(615) 974-4466
Director: Dr. Ernest Brewer

HEP's (cont.)

SER - Jobs for Progress, Inc.
1355 River Bend Dr., Suite 350
Dalles, TX 75247
(214) 631-3999
Director: Ms. Rosalinda Torres

Pan American University
1201 University Drive
Edinburg, TX 78539
(512) 381-2521
Director: Mr. Larry Rincones

Univ. of Texas El Paso
University @ Hawthorne Streets
Campus Box 29
El Paso, TX 79968
(915) 747-5562
Director: Mr. Arturo Lazarin

University of Houston
4800 Calhoun, Suite 405 FH
Houston, TX 77004
(713) 749-2193
Director: Dr. Don Sanders

Washington State University
335 Cleveland
Pullman, WA 99164-2122
(509) 335-2454 ex. 5652
Director: Ms. Anita Babayan

Univ. of Milwaukee-Wisconsin
P.O. Box 413
Milwaukee, WI 53201
(414) 563-5385
Director: Mr. Salomon Flores

CAMPS

Boise State University
1910 Univiversity Dr., Room E-214
Boise, ID 83725
(208) 385-1194
Director: Dr. Jay Fuhriman

St. Edward's University
3001 S. Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78704
(512) 448-8625
Director: Ms. Randa Safady

Pan American University
1201 West University Drive
Edinburg, TX 78539
(512) 381-2574
Director: Ms. Mary Herrera

University of Texas El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968
(915) 747-5562
Director: Mr. Arturo Lazarin

Central Washington University
EOP
Ellensburg, WA 98926
(509) 963-1303
Director: Mr. Martin Yanez

California State Univ., Fresno
Joyal Administration Bldg. Rm. 220
Fresno, CA 93740
(209) 294-4768
Director: Mr. Raul Diaz